



EXHIBIT C — DIRECTOR SELF ATTESTATION FORM

Attached Below

This tailored disclosure is directed to Defendants Stefan Safko and Scott Harvey. It seeks complete, transaction-related disclosures on a substance-over-form basis. Provide full and accurate responses. Failure to do so will trigger escalation to request that the Court grant a court-ordered ESI search of personal and professional accounts, as well as targeted third-party subpoenas (including to Luminar and banking institutions).

What “Direct” and “Indirect” Mean (Substance Over Form)

Direct: Any value paid or delivered to you personally in connection with or in consideration of the Luminar transaction. Examples include cash wires/ACH, checks, stock or RSU grants, option or warrant grants, retention or transaction bonuses, advisory/consulting fees, reimbursement payments, or forgiveness of amounts owed by you.

Indirect: Any value routed to or for your benefit through other persons or entities in connection with or in consideration of the Luminar transaction. Examples include payments to your LLC/LLP or other affiliated entity; payments to family members or trusts; honoraria or service fees paid to third parties at your direction; in-kind benefits (travel, lodging, equipment); debt or note purchases/forgiveness; off-payroll contractor payments; equity or warrants granted to an affiliate; or consideration labeled as “employment,”

“consulting,” or “integration support” arising from or conditioned on the transaction.

Substance over form applies: labels such as “employment,” “consulting,” or “retention” do not alter the transactional nature of consideration if it exists because of, or was negotiated in tandem with, the Luminar asset sale.

Cross-Validation & Enforcement

Your responses could be cross-validated against (i) Luminar records via its General Counsel and CFO (including AP/treasury logs, stock issuance ledgers, and vendor files), (ii) ESI (emails, attachments, metadata) from agreed custodians, and (iii) bank records obtained by subpoena (wire confirmations, ACH logs, remittance details). Non-disclosure or minimization may result in adverse inferences, fee shifting, sanctions, and escalation to Court for an order compelling ESI collection and production.

Authority Supporting This Tailored Request (8 Del. C. § 220)

- *AmerisourceBergen Corp. v. Lebanon Cty. Emps. Ret. Fund*, 243 A.3d 417 (Del. 2020) — credible-basis standard; court tailors inspections to accomplish proper purpose.
- *KT4 Partners LLC v. Palantir Techs., Inc.*, 203 A.3d 738 (Del. 2019) — ESI/emails may be required where necessary and essential to fulfill the stockholder’s purpose.

- *Seinfeld v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.*, 909 A.2d 117 (Del. 2006) — stockholder need only show a credible basis to suspect wrongdoing to obtain inspection.
- *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Ind. Elec. Workers Pension Tr. Fund IBEW*, 95 A.3d 1264 (Del. 2014) — inspection to investigate wrongdoing; officer-level and high-level materials may be required.
- *Tiger v. Boast Apparel, Inc.*, 214 A.3d 933 (Del. 2019) — confidentiality is not automatic; scope and conditions are tailored to the purpose.

In light of these authorities, the following schedules are narrowly tailored to confirm who received value (directly or indirectly) in connection with the transaction. You are encouraged to itemize each payment separately. If you respond fully and accurately, broader ESI burden may be avoided. If you do not, Plaintiff will escalate to request a court-ordered ESI search and third-party subpoenas.

Stefan Safko

[illegible]

Scott Harvey

[illegible]

Ronjon Nag

[illegible]

Peter Hsieh

[illegible]

Bob Denaro

[illegible]

Jim DiSanto

[illegible]

Fabien Chraim (Controlling Stockholder, ~18% Voting Power; Common Class)

Fabien changed his stance on the vote approximately one week before closing and cast ~18% of the vote in favor. Disclose any compensation, inducements, or benefits (direct or indirect) provided to Fabien in connection with the transaction, including any consideration not reflected in board minutes.

[illegible]

Solfice India Employees (0% Ownership, Reported ~\$100K Bonuses)

It is known that remote employees in Solstice India's office, who held no stock ownership, were paid roughly \$100K bonuses. Disclose all such payments, itemized by employee name, including who authorized them and the source of funds.

[illegible]

Any Other Recipient Not Listed Above

[illegible]

Certification

I certify under oath that the above information is complete and accurate. I understand that failure to provide full disclosure may result in escalation to Court for an order compelling ESI collection and production, third-party subpoenas, adverse inferences, fee shifting, and sanctions.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name: _____