IN THE GRAND COURT OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS

FINANCIAL SERVICES DIVISION

CAUSE NO: FSD OF 2026 ( )

IN THE MATTER OF SECTION 92 OF THE COMPANIES ACT (2026 REVISION)

AND IN THE MATTER OF LIANBIO

WINDING UP PETITION

To the Grand Court

The humble petition of Exploration Capital Fund, LP ("**the Petitioner**") shows that:

The Company

1 LianBio ("**the Company**") was incorporated under the Companies Act (2026 Revision) ("**Companies Act**") as an exempted limited company on 17 July 2019 under registration number 353467.

2 The registered office of the Company is situated at International Corporation Services Ltd, PO Box 472 Harbour Place, 2nd Floor, North Wing, 103 South Church Street, George Town, Grand Cayman, KY1-1106, Cayman Islands.

This Petition was presented by Maples and Calder (Cayman) LLP whose address for service is PO Box 309, Ugland House, George Town, Grand Cayman, KY1-1104, Cayman Islands (Ref: MWI/HDB/879490-000001/88289718).

3 The Company's principal executive office is located at 103 Carnegie Center Drive, Suite 215, Princeton, New Jersey 08540, USA.

4 Prior to the events pleaded below, the Company carried on business as a biopharmaceutical company focussed on developing and commercialising medicines across multiple therapeutic areas including cardiovascular, oncology, ophthalmology and inflammatory diseases in China and Asian markets.

5 On or about 3 November 2021, the Company's American Depositary Shares ("**ADSs**") were listed on the NASDAQ stock exchange. Each ADS represented one ordinary share in the Company. Citibank N.A. acted as the Depositary for the ADSs ("**Depositary**").

6 The Company's issued share capital consists of 109,893,751 ordinary shares.

7 As at the date of the Petition, the Company is solvent. Its assets, which consist of cash or near-cash equivalents, are likely close to $40 million, and exceed its liabilities. Unless otherwise stated, all references below to $ are to United States Dollars.

The Petitioner

8 The Petitioner is a Delaware limited partnership and investment fund with its registered office at 310 N 110 W, Vineyard, UT, 84059-8129, USA.

9 The Petitioner owns 26,244,387 fully paid-up shares in the Company, representing approximately 23.9% of the Company's issued share capital.

10 The Petitioner holds the following ordinary shares which were transferred to it by the Depositary's affiliate Citi Nominees Limited as follows:

Date	Number of Shares
27 June 2025	13,575,000

20 March 2026	11,147,703
30 March 2026	1,521,684
Total:	**26,244,387** shares

11 Pursuant to the above, the Petitioner has held 13,575,000 ordinary shares for a period of at least six months immediately prior to the presentation of the winding up petition.

Background to Petition

12 The Company was founded by Perceptive Advisors, an investment management firm with approximately $9.5 billion assets under management as at 1 December 2025 ("**Perceptive Advisors**").

13 The directors of the Company are Mr Konstantin Poukalov and Mr Adam Stone:

13.1 Mr Poukalov is the executive chairman of the Company, a managing director of Perceptive Advisors, and a director of LianMedical (defined below); and

13.2 Mr Stone is the Chief Investment Officer of Perceptive Advisors.

14 Perceptive Advisors and its affiliates ("**Perceptive**") are, when combined, the largest shareholder group in the Company who are stated to own 57,575,280 shares, or approximately 52.4% of the Company's issued share capital. The Perceptive parties include Perceptive Life Sciences Master Fund, Ltd; LEV LB Holdings, LP, Perceptive Xontogeny Venture Fund, LP, C2 Life Sciences LLC, Mr Poukalov and Mr Stone.

15 In February 2024, the Company announced the completion of its strategic review and its decision to wind down the Company's operations. A United States Securities and Exchange Commission ("**SEC**") NASDAQ 8-K filing by the Company published on 13 February 2024 stated, amongst other things:

LianBio will begin to wind down operations immediately, and intends to pursue the sale of its remaining pipeline assets as part of the wind down process. To the extent such sales are successful, the Company expects to distribute any profits from the sales to its then-current shareholders in a subsequent distribution before the final dissolution of the Company.

16 As part of the wind-down and dissolution process, on or about 13 February 2024 the Company announced its intention to deregister with the SEC and to delist from NASDAQ, and its ADSs thereafter began to trade over the counter on OTC Markets' Pink Limited Market ("**OTC**").

17 Consistent with its wind-down and dissolution process, on or about 13 February 2024 the Company declared a first liquidating distribution in the amount of $4.80 per share totalling approximately $528 million, which distribution was paid out shortly afterwards.

18 In a press release dated 20 June 2025, the Company announced a second liquidating distribution in the amount of $0.43 per share totalling approximately $47.3 million, which was paid out shortly afterwards.

19 Following these distributions, the assets of the Company as at 30 September 2025 were stated to primarily comprise i) approximately $21 million of net asset value (consisting mainly of cash and cash equivalents, short-term receivables, and net of de minimis liabilities), plus ii) the potential to receive an additional $20 million of cash from a milestone payment from an earn-out license arrangement with Xi An Grand Chang An Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd ("**Grand Pharma**") should China's National Medical Products Administration ("**NMPA**") approve a drug called TP-03 ("**Grand Pharma Milestone**").

20 By early 2026, the winding-up and dissolution of LianBio was an estimated 93% to 96% complete with the Company having already distributed $575.3 million and with an estimated $21 million to $41 million still to be distributed.

21 All that largely remained to do to complete LianBio's wind-down were:

20.1 The potential triggering of the $20 million Grand Pharma Milestone;

20.2 The receipt of any milestone proceeds from Grand Pharma; and

20.3 The distribution of the milestone proceeds along with the other remaining net cash to LianBio shareholders.

The Proposed Merger Transaction

22 Over two years into LianBio's winding-up and dissolution process, on 9 March 2026, the Company issued a Proxy Statement announcing that it intended to merge with a private company called LianMedical ("**LianMedical**"), an exempted company limited by shares incorporated under the laws of the Cayman Islands, pursuant to Part 16 of the Companies Act ("**Merger Transaction**").

23 According to the Proxy Statement, LianMedical had been developed with the support of Perceptive Advisors who, together with affiliates, own approximately 97.6% of the shares in LianMedical.

24 Financials for LianMedical were not included in the Proxy Statement. As a result, LianMedical's revenue, profitability/unprofitability, cash flow, and indebtedness is not known by the Petitioner.

25 LianMedical is a private company, and as a result, there is no publicly-traded stock to look to for an estimate of its equity value.

26 LianMedical is a Cayman Islands exempted limited company headquartered in Shanghai, China, which is stated to be involved in the development and commercialisation of medical device innovations in neurology and cardiovascular medicine in China and other Asian markets, although its actual business and value is not known by the Petitioner.

27 The Merger Transaction would have resulted in pre-merger LianBio shareholders owning approximately 27.2% of the combined company, and pre-merger LianMedical shareholders would own approximately 72.8% of the combined company.

28 LianBio's Board approved the merger, but the Board consists of only two directors, both of whom are employees of Perceptive.

29 The Proxy Statement stated that Perceptive held 57,575,280 ordinary shares in the Company and had undertaken to vote all of their shares in favour of the Merger Transaction. On the basis of there being 109,893,751 shares expected to be outstanding on the share record date of 11 March 2026 ("**Share Record Date**"), the Proxy Statement anticipated that a quorum would be assured at an extraordinary general meeting ("**EGM**").

30 The Company took steps to ensure that Perceptive's vote in favour of the Merger Transaction would guarantee LianBio shareholder approval (by the requisite two-thirds of votes cast) by reducing the maximum number of votes that might be cast:

30.1 The Company failed to instruct or cause the Depositary to set a record date for ADS holders, whereby ADS holders of that record date could instruct the Depositary on how to vote their underlying shares;

30.2 The Company failed to instruct or cause the Depositary to collect ADS holders' voting instructions for the shares held by the Depositary on behalf of ADS holders, thereby depriving those ADS holders from voting their underlying shares on the approval of the Merger Transaction;

30.3 The Company failed to instruct or cause the Depositary to distribute the Proxy Statement to ADS holders. The Petitioner only received the Proxy Statement because it held shares in addition to its ADS by March 2026; and

30.4 The Share Record Date (11 March 2026) was set 2 days after the date of the Proxy Statement, thereby practically precluding ADS holders that might become aware of the pending Merger Transaction from being able to vote by converting their ADS into shares on or before the Share Record Date.

31 Given the Company failed to instruct or cause the Depositary to distribute the Proxy Statement to ADS holders, ADS holders who did not also hold shares and receive the Proxy Statement were practically deprived of their dissenter rights under s.238 of the Companies Act.

32 Under the terms of the proposed Merger Transaction as set out in the Proxy Statement:

32.1 The Merger Transaction valued the Company's equity at $25 million and LianMedical's equity at $67 million (both on a fully diluted basis);

32.2 Existing ordinary shares in the Company (including those represented by ADSs) would remain issued, outstanding and unchanged; and

32.3 Each ordinary share of LianMedical was to be cancelled in exchange for 68.3775 newly issued ordinary shares in the Company.

33 There were no fairness opinions obtained to support either LianBio’s $25 million valuation or LianMedical’s $67 million valuation.

34 The effect of the Merger Transaction, if completed, would have been that:

34.1 Perceptive would own approximately 85.3% of the issued and outstanding ordinary shares of the merged entity on a fully diluted basis;

34.2 Existing shareholders of the Company (including the Petitioner), and ADS holders, would be diluted to own approximately 12.9% of the issued and outstanding share capital on a fully diluted basis;

34.3 As per the Proxy Statement, the Merger Transaction "does not materially alter the planned dissolution of [LianBio's pre-merger] entities, which will largely continue"; and

34.4 Given LianBio's pre-merger assets were to be wound-up and converted to cash irrespective of the Merger Transaction, LianBio's minority shareholders would be forcibly required to invest into LianMedical.

35 The Company's equity was valued at $25 million for the purposes of the Merger Transaction, derived as follows:

35.1 An anonymous but purportedly independent valuation advisor retained by the Company ("**Company Valuation Advisor**") prepared a valuation of the Company using an asset-based approach, based on balance sheet information as at 30 September 2025. The Company Valuation Advisor concluded an approximate net asset value of $21 million;

35.2 The Company Valuation Advisor noted potential off-balance-sheet and/or contingent assets, including milestone payments or royalty income, but stated that it lacked sufficient information (without elaborating as to why) to assign value to those assets and they were not reflected in the net asset value conclusion;

35.3 The opinion of the Company Valuation Advisor was stated not to be a fairness opinion, a solvency opinion, or an appraisal of fair value for the purposes of s.238 of the Companies Act;

35.4 In addition to the $21 million of net asset value (that excludes the Grand Pharma Milestone), the Board ascribed approximately $4 million to the contingent $20 million Grand Pharma Milestone referred to above at paragraph 19; and

35.5 The Proxy Statement did not provide any detail as to the key valuation inputs such as the probability that TP-03 received NMPA approval, the time until the cash would be received, or the discount rate the Board used in its $4 million valuation of the potential $20 million milestone payment.

36 LianMedical's equity was valued at $67.0 million for the purposes of the Merger Transaction, derived as follows:

36.1 LianMedical purportedly retained a third-party valuation advisor ("**LianMedical Valuation Advisor**") to prepare a valuation of LianMedical.

36.2 The LianMedical Valuation Advisor concluded a fair market value of equity for LianMedical of $66.45 million as at 15 September 2025.

36.3 This valuation was provided as discussion materials for transaction planning purposes and did not constitute a fairness opinion or a recommendation regarding any transaction.

36.4 The Company Valuation Advisor also analysed LianMedical and indicated a rounded equity value range of approximately $63.0 million to $98.4 million. No supporting calculations or analysis is provided in the Proxy Statement, and as a result, it is unclear how this rounded equity value range was calculated.

36.5 Without any further support in the Proxy Statement as to how the figure was selected, LianMedical's equity value for the Merger Transaction was set at $67.0 million.

36.6 Apart from a general description of LianMedical, no detailed information about LianMedical's business was provided in connection with the Merger Transaction.

37 On 22 March 2026, China's NMPA officially approved TP-03 for commercialisation in Mainland China and Grand Pharma publicly announced this approval on 23 March 2026.

38 A supplemental Proxy Statement dated 2 April 2026 (the "**Supplement**") stated that the Company had a right to receive a milestone payment of up to $20 million under its agreement with Grand Pharma, and that the Company believed that the NMPA approval satisfied the conditions for the milestone payment to become payable.

39 Notwithstanding the achievement of the Grand Pharma TP-03 milestone event:

39.1 No change was made to the $4 million valuation of the Grand Pharma Milestone, the $25 million valuation of the entire Company, the terms of the proposed Merger Transaction, or the exchange ratio; and

39.2 The Supplement stated on page 2 that although the regulatory milestone had been achieved, there remained "substantial uncertainty regarding the collectability of the milestone payment" and that the Company lacked "current visibility into Grand Pharma's ability or intention to remit the payment", and the Board continued to recommend that the Company's shareholders vote in favour of the Merger Transaction.

The EGM

40 The Petitioner filed an objection notice to the Merger Transaction with the Company on 2 April 2026.

41 The EGM was convened on 9 April 2026 at 10:00 a.m. Eastern time at the offices of Womble Bond Dickinson (US) LLP, 888 7th Avenue, 38th Floor, New York, NY 10106, USA.

42 Approval of the Merger and name change resolutions required at least two-thirds of the votes cast by shareholders entitled to vote, present in person or by proxy. Voting was to take place by way of poll, given Perceptive had undertaken to demand a poll vote.

43 On 21 April 2026, the Petitioner received an authorisation notice from the Company stating that the Merger had been approved by special resolution at the EGM.

44 On 6 May 2026, the Petitioner filed a Dissent Notice with the Company pursuant to s.238 of the Companies Act, thereby exercising its dissenter rights to appraisal.

45 The Proxy Statement had indicated that completion of the Merger Transaction was expected no later than just 3 weeks after the EGM “by the end of April 2026, after shareholders of each of the Company and LianMedical approve the Merger” and that no major regulatory approvals or financing conditions were required.

46 However, the Merger Transaction has not been completed and does not appear to be effective.

47 As at the date of this Petition, the Petitioner has not received a fair value offer from the Company pursuant to s.238 of the Companies Act.

48 On 22 May 2026, the Petitioner wrote to the Company enquiring as to the status of closing of the Merger Transaction.

49 On 27 May 2026, Mr Poukalov responded on behalf of the Company stating that the Company did not have an update but would ensure that the Petitioner or its Cayman Islands counsel received notice when the Merger Transaction was complete.

50 Mr Poukalov’s email did not contain an update as to whether LianMedical shareholders voted to approve the Merger Transaction.

51 As at the date of this Petition, the Petitioner has received no further communication from the Company regarding the status of the Merger Transaction or its dissenter rights.

52 Consequently, as the Merger Transaction has not completed and the Petitioner's shares have not been cancelled, there are no available dissenter rights pursuant to s.238 of the Companies Act, nor has any information been provided by the Company as to the status of the Company's assets.

53 The Petitioner seeks an order that the Company be wound up on the just and equitable ground pursuant to s.92(e) of the Companies Act upon the basis that there has been serious misconduct, that the Merger Transaction was unlawful, that there has been oppressive conduct and/or a want of probity on the part of the Company and Perceptive, that the Company has lost its substratum, and that in all the circumstances it is just and equitable that the Company be wound up.

Merger is Unlawful / Oppression and Want of Probity

54 The Merger Transaction was apparently proposed, negotiated, recommended, and approved by a Board consisting of two directors, both of whom are employees of Perceptive Advisors, whose affiliated parties own 52.4% of the shares of the Company and 97.6% of the shares of LianMedical.

55 The Merger Transaction was a related-party transaction in which Perceptive sought to acquire for its affiliated parties, a majority shareholding in the surviving entity in the Merger Transaction on terms which:

55.1 Diluted the Petitioner and other minority shareholders from holding approximately a combined 47.6% of the Company to holding approximately 12.9% of the surviving company after the proposed Merger Transaction on a fully diluted basis;

55.2 Consolidated the ability of Perceptive to control LianBio from a majority vote of approximately 52.4% to a majority vote of approximately 85.3% of the surviving entity;

55.3 Valued the Company at a level ($25 million) which failed to take proper account of the Company's assets, in particular the expected cash from the TP-03 milestone payment(s);

55.4 Valued LianMedical at $67 million without providing financial statements, adequate valuation support, or even a detailed description of the business; and

55.5 Reversed the Company's previously announced wind-down and dissolution that began in early 2024 and utilised the available cash and assets of LianBio for LianMedical's business.

56 Despite acknowledging the conflicts in the Merger Transaction, the Board did not take any adequate procedural steps to address them. No independent committee of directors was constituted to consider or negotiate the terms of the Transaction on behalf of minority shareholders.

57 The valuation of the Company at $25 million for the purposes of the Merger Transaction was improper in the following respects:

57.1 The valuation was prepared on an asset-based approach using balance sheet information as at 30 September 2025, which was more than five months' stale by the time of the Proxy Statement and even more so by the time of the EGM;

57.2 The Company Valuation Advisor expressly excluded from its net asset value conclusion certain off-balance-sheet and contingent assets, including milestone payments and royalty income, on the basis that it lacked sufficient information, notwithstanding that these assets were known to exist;

57.3 The Board's ascription of only $4 million risk-adjusted value to a potential $20 million Grand Pharma Milestone payment was inadequately explained and unsupported by any disclosed methodology;

57.4 The identity of the Company Valuation Advisor was not disclosed, depriving shareholders of the ability to assess the qualifications and independence of the valuer;

57.5 No fairness opinions were obtained in connection with the Merger Transaction; and

57.6 The Transaction value attributed to LianMedical of $67 million exceeded LianMedical's own valuation advisor's conclusion of $66.45 million fair market equity value, and was set by the conflicted Board without any explanation.

58 The NMPA approval of TP-03 for commercialisation in China was a material post-valuation event which:

58.1 Transformed the Grand Pharma Milestone payment from a contingent, uncertain prospect into an earned and payable obligation;

58.2 Materially increased the fair value of the Company up to approximately $41 million (which would represent a 64% increase on the Company's valuation of $25 million);

58.3 Fundamentally undermined the basis upon which the Board had ascribed only $4 million risk-adjusted value to the milestone (being uncertainty as to "timing and likelihood of achievement"); and

58.4 Moved the Grand Pharma Milestone squarely within the prior parameters of the Company Valuation Advisor's valuation of LianBio given the milestone payment became a receivable rather than an off-balance-sheet contingent asset without any updated valuation by the Company Valuation Advisor being included in the Supplement.

59 Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Board declined to revise the merger terms, the exchange ratio, or the $25 million equity value of the Company. The Supplement's assertion that there remained "substantial uncertainty regarding collectability" and a lack of "current visibility" into Grand Pharma's intention to pay was inadequate justification for leaving the Company's equity

value unchanged in circumstances where the underlying contingency (regulatory approval) had been satisfied.

60 The failure to update the Company's valuation following the crystallisation of the TP-03 milestone operated to the detriment of minority shareholders and to the advantage of Perceptive, who stood to acquire a greater proportionate interest in the Company's assets (now enhanced by the milestone receivable) at no additional cost.

61 The manner in which the EGM was convened and conducted was unlawful, oppressive and lacked probity. In particular:

61.1 The Company failed to instruct or cause the Depositary to distribute the Proxy Statement to ADS holders, and as a result ADS holders (who did not also hold shares) did not receive notice of the EGM, nor were they informed as to their dissenter rights;

61.2 The Company failed to instruct or cause the Depositary to set a record date for ADS holders, and also failed to instruct or cause the Depositary to collect ADS holders' voting instructions for the shares held by the Depositary on behalf of ADS holders, thereby depriving those ADS holders from voting their underlying shares on the approval of the Merger Transaction;

61.3 Furthermore, for ADS holders who also owned shares directly (and thereby received the Proxy Statement), the record date for voting shares was set for 11 March 2026 (2 days after the date on the Proxy Statement), thereby practically preventing ADS holders from converting their ADS into shares by the 11 March 2026 record date (the Petitioner immediately tried and its conversion transaction was not completed until 20 March 2026), which ensured no ADS holders as of 9 March 2026 could vote on the Merger Transaction;

61.4 With no ADS holders as of 9 March 2026 able to either i) convert their ADS to shares by the 11 March 2026 record date, or ii) direct the Depositary on how to vote the shares underlying their ADS (if the ADS holder was even made aware of the Merger Transaction given the Proxy Statement was not sent to them), the maximum number of votes cast was reduced to such a level as to ensure Perceptive's vote alone would result in the two-thirds of votes cast needed to approve the Merger Transaction; and

61.5 ADS holders (who did not also hold shares) were practically deprived of their dissenter rights under s.238 of the Companies Act.

62 Additionally, the Company has not informed shareholders about the current situation, the Company's assets, or the likely receipt of the milestone payment from Grand Pharma.

63 By reason of the matters set out above, taken individually or cumulatively, the Petitioner has lost all confidence in the management of the Company and in the probity of its directors in relation to the conduct of the Company's affairs. In particular:

63.1 The directors will continue to act in the interests of Perceptive rather than in the interests of the Company's shareholders as a whole;

63.2 The Company's remaining assets (including the Grand Pharma Milestone receivable) will not be properly realised for the benefit of all shareholders; and

63.3 Perceptive may, whether through the Merger Transaction or otherwise, seek to transfer, deploy, or invest the Company's cash and/or assets for the benefit of LianMedical and/or Perceptive without adequate disclosure, shareholder approval, or scrutiny.

64 The Company is dormant and has no ongoing operating activities (being many years into its previously voluntary winding-up), such that its substratum has gone and its stated purpose has

been to wind down and distribute its remaining assets to shareholders. Moreover, the Proxy Statement makes clear the Company’s intent to continue winding-up pre-merger LianBio’s assets in the event the merger closes.

65 In all the circumstances, it is just and equitable that the Company be wound up pursuant to section 92(e) of the Companies Act.

Your Petitioner therefore humbly prays that:

(1) The Company be wound up by this Court pursuant to section 92(e) of the Companies Act on the just and equitable ground and that such further or alternative relief be granted as this Court shall think fit;

(2) Margot MacInnis and Sandipan Bhowmik of Grant Thornton Specialist Services (Cayman) Limited be appointed as official liquidators of the Company, alternatively that such other person or persons as this Court thinks fit be appointed as official liquidators ("**JOLs**");

(3) The JOLs shall not be required to give security for their appointment;

(4) The JOLs shall have the power to act jointly and severally in their capacity as liquidators of the Company;

(5) The JOLs be authorised to take such action as may be necessary or desirable to obtain recognition of the appointment of the JOLs in any relevant jurisdiction and to make application to the courts of such jurisdiction for that purpose;

(6) The JOLs be authorised to exercise all the powers set out in Part II of the Third Schedule to the Companies Act within and outside the Cayman Islands without further sanction of the Court;

(7) No disposition of the Company's property by or with the authority of the JOLs in carrying out their duties and functions and the exercise of their powers under any order granted pursuant to this Petition shall be voided by s.99 of the Companies Act;

(8) The JOLs be at liberty to appoint attorneys and professional advisors whether in the Cayman Islands or elsewhere as they may consider necessary to advise and assist them in the performance of their duties in accordance with Order 25 of the Companies Winding Up Rules;

(9) Subject to s.109(2) of the Companies Act and the Insolvency Practitioners Regulations, the JOLs be authorised to render and pay invoices out of the assets of the Company for their own remuneration and the JOLs be at liberty to meet all disbursements reasonably incurred in connection with the performance of their duties;

(10) The Court make such orders as may be necessary to give effect to the relief sought and to prevent any action that would seek to undo the Court's regulation of the conduct of the Company's affairs without further order of the Court;

(11) An order that the costs of and incidental to this Petition be paid out of the assets of the Company, alternatively that the Respondent do pay the Petitioner's costs of and incidental to this Petition on an indemnity basis, to be taxed if not agreed; and

(12) Such further or other relief as this Honourable Court shall think fit.

Dated the 26th day of June 2026

Maples and Calder (Cayman) LLP

Maples and Calder (Cayman) LLP

NOTE: This petition is intended to be served on the Company.

This Petition was presented by Maples and Calder (Cayman) LLP whose address for service is PO Box 309, Ugland House, George Town, Grand Cayman, KY1-1104, Cayman Islands (Ref: MWI/879490-000001/88289718).HDB/879490-000001/88409658v1

NOTICE OF HEARING

TAKE NOTICE THAT the hearing of this petition will take place at the Law Courts, George Town, Grand Cayman, on [***state the hearing date***] at 10.00am.

Any correspondence or communication with the Court relating to the hearing of this petition should be addressed to the Registrar of the Financial Services Division of the Grand Court at PO Box 495, Grand Cayman, KY1-1106, telephone 345 949 4296.

This Petition was presented by Maples and Calder (Cayman) LLP whose address for service is PO Box 309, Ugland House, George Town, Grand Cayman, KY1-1104, Cayman Islands (Ref: MWI/879490-000001/88289718).HDB/879490-000001/88409658v1