

37. Proceedings before a court, arbitration body or public administration authority

As at 31 December 2017, the Bank was not involved in any proceedings before a court, arbitration body, or public administration authority concerning liabilities of the Bank or its subsidiaries, which represent at least 10% of the Bank's equity. Moreover, the total value of claims concerning liabilities of the Bank or its subsidiary in all proceedings before a court, an arbitration body or a public administration authority as at 31 December 2017 was also not higher than 10% of the Bank's equity.

The Bank monitors the status of all legal proceedings brought against the Bank and the level of required provisions.

Information on the most important court proceedings relating to the issuer's contingent liabilities

1. Claims of Interbrok's clients

Since 14 August 2008, 170 entities which have been clients of Interbrok Investment E. Drózdź i Spółka Spółka jawna (hereinafter Interbrok) called the Bank for amicable settlement for the total amount of PLN 385,520 thousand via the District Court in Warsaw. Nine compensation lawsuits were filed against the Bank. Eight of the nine lawsuits were filed by former clients of Interbrok for the total amount of PLN 800 thousand with the proviso that the claims may be extended up to the total amount of PLN 5,950 thousand. The plaintiffs alleged that the Bank had aided in Interbrok's illegal activities, which caused damage to them. With regard to seven of the afore-mentioned cases, legal proceedings against the Bank were dismissed and the cases were finally concluded. In the eighth case, a plaintiff withdrew their suit waiving the claim and the Regional Court dismissed the action. As far as the ninth suit is concerned, the amount in dispute is PLN 275,423 thousand, including statutory interest and costs of proceedings. According to the claims brought in the suit, this amount comprises the receivables, acquired by the plaintiff by way of assignment, due to the parties aggrieved by Interbrok on account of a reduction (as a result of Interbrok's bankruptcy) of the receivables by a return of the deposits paid by the aggrieved for making investments on the forex market. The plaintiff claims the Bank's liability on the grounds of the Bank's aid in committing the illicit act of Interbrok, consisting in unlicensed brokerage operations. On 7 November 2017, the Regional Court in Warsaw dismissed the action in its entirety. The ruling is not final.

2. Class action against mBank S.A. concerning the clause on changing interest rate

On 4 February 2011, a class action filed with the Regional Court in Łódź on 20 December 2010 by the Municipal Consumer Ombudsman representing a group of 835 individuals, the Bank's retail banking clients, was served on the Bank. The class action was filed to determine the Bank's liability for the improper performance of mortgage loan agreements. It was in particular claimed that the Bank had improperly applied provisions of agreements on changing interest rate, namely that the Bank had not lowered interest on loans, despite the fact that, according to the plaintiff, it was obliged to do so. The Bank does not agree with the above-mentioned allegations. On 18 February 2011, the Bank responded to the lawsuit filing for its dismissal in whole.

On 6 May 2011, the Regional Court in Łódź decided to dismiss the application for dismissing the lawsuit, filed by mBank S.A., and admitted the case to be heard as a class action. In response to this decision, mBank S.A. filed a complaint with the Court of Appeal in Łódź on 13 June 2011. However, the Court of Appeal in Łódź dismissed mBank S.A.'s complaint on 28 September 2011. Currently, the case proceeds as a class action. Until March 2012, new individuals had been joining the class action. As at 17 October 2012, the group of class members consisted of 1,247 individuals. The Regional Court in Łódź did not establish bail for the benefit of mBank S.A., which was applied for by the Bank. The Bank filed a complaint about this decision. But on 29 November 2012, the Court of Appeal in Łódź overturned the Bank's complaint about the establishment of bail. The judgment is binding and the plaintiff is not obliged to pay bail. The final statement of defence was sent in January 2013 and on 15 February 2013, the plaintiff answered it in a pleading. By its decision of 18 February 2013, the Regional Court in Łódź submitted the case to mediation. On 26 February 2013, the Municipal Consumer Ombudsman appealed against the case being submitted to mediation. On 22 June 2013, a trial was held and on 3 July 2013, the Court announced its judgment allowing the claim in full. According to the Court, the Bank did not properly execute the agreements concluded with consumers, as a result of which they suffered losses. The Bank appealed against this judgment on 9 September 2013. However, on 30 April 2014, the Court of Appeal in Łódź dismissed the appeal of mBank S.A.,

upholding the stance adopted by the Regional Court expressed in the judgment. Upon receiving a written justification of the judgment, mBank S.A. brought a cassation appeal. The cassation appeal was filed with the Supreme Court by mBank S.A. on 3 October 2014. By its decision of 7 October 2014, the Court of Appeal in Łódź suspended the enforcement of the judgment passed by the Regional Court until the cassation appeal of mBank S.A. has been resolved. On 18 February 2015, the Supreme Court accepted the cassation appeal filed by mBank S.A. for review. On 14 May 2015, the Supreme Court revoked the ruling of the Court of Appeal in Łódź and referred the case back to that court for re-examination. By the decision of 24 September 2015, the Court of Appeal in Łódź admitted the expert opinion evidence in order to verify the legality of mBank's actions connected with changing the interest rates on the mortgage loans covered by the class action in the period from 1 January 2009 to 28 February 2010.

mBank S.A. received the expert's opinion in April 2016. Both parties filed pleadings in which they commented on the opinion. On 22 June 2016, the Court of Appeal in Łódź obliged the expert to submit a supplementary opinion answering the comments made by the parties. The supplementary opinion was issued in September 2016. The expert sustained all the arguments and the standpoint presented in the initial opinion.

On 24 February 2017, a trial was held during which the court admitted the oral supplementary expert opinion as evidence; however, the opinion did not allay the Court's doubts so by the resolution of 6 April 2017, the Court of Appeal admitted another written supplementary expert opinion as evidence. The supplementary opinion was issued by an expert and presented to Parties for comments. On 29 September 2017, the Bank submitted a comprehensive piece of writing with its comments on the opinion. The Parties have been exchanging their opinions to date - mBank provided further explanations relating to the manner and methodology of setting the loan interest rate. The Bank is waiting for the date of the hearing before the Court of Appeal in Łódź to be set.

3. Class action against mBank S.A. concerning indexation clauses

On 4 April 2016, the Municipal Consumer Ombudsman representing a group of 390 individuals, retail clients of mBank, who concluded agreements on CHF-indexed mortgage loans with mBank, filed a class action with the Regional Court in Łódź against the Bank. With subsequent pleadings, the plaintiff reported other individuals who gradually joined the class action.

The class action includes alternative claims for declaring invalidity of the loan agreements in part i.e. in the scope of the provisions related to indexation, or in whole; or for finding that the indexation provisions are invalid as they permit indexation of over 20% and below 20% at the CHF exchange rate from the table of exchange rates of mBank S.A. applicable as at the date of conclusion of each of the loan agreements.

By its decision of 19 December 2016, the Regional Court in Łódź admitted the case to be heard as a class action. mBank filed a complaint about this decision; however, the Court of Appeal in Łódź dismissed the complaint on 15 March 2017.

By its decision of 9 May 2017, the Regional Court in Łódź decided on instigating a class action and set the time limit of three months from the publication of the decision for persons whose claims may be covered by the class action to join the class. Within the time limit set, 352 persons joined the group of class members. At present, there are 1,717 individuals in the group. The Court has not set the date of the trial.

As at 31 December 2017, the Bank was not involved in any proceedings before a court, arbitration body, or public administration authority concerning receivables of the Bank or its subsidiaries, which represent at least 10% of the Bank's equity. The total value of claims concerning receivables of the Bank or its subsidiaries in all proceedings before a court, an arbitration body or a public administration authority underway at 31 December 2017 was also not higher than 10% of the Bank's equity.

Tax audits

On 23 November 2017 at mBank S.A. has started the tax inspection regarding the correctness of settlement of the tax on goods and services due to the import of services for 2015, conducted by employees of the Mazowiecki Customs and Tax Office in Warsaw. The tax audit is under way.

From 29 January 2016 to 30 May 2017, officers of the Treasury Control Office in Warsaw (Urząd Kontroli Skarbowej) carried out an inspection in mLeasing relating to the reliability of the declared tax bases and the correctness of the calculation and payment of tax on goods and services for Q2 2014. Additionally, the inspection aimed at determining whether mLeasing is a relevant person

within the meaning of the Act of 16 November 2000 on Counteracting Money Laundering and Terrorism Financing and, in the case of confirming the status, at verifying its compliance with the obligations arising from the aforesaid act. The inspection revealed no major irregularities.

From 13 June 2016 to 13 September 2016, the French Tax Authority conducted tax audit in the company mFinance France in terms of the regularity of tax settlements (including CIT and VAT) for the period from 1 January 2013 to 31 December 2015. The audit did not identify any irregularities.

Within the period from 12 April 2016 to 17 June 2016, the First Mazovian Treasury Office in Warsaw (Pierwszy Mazowiecki Urząd Skarbowy w Warszawie) carried out control in terms of the legitimacy of tax on goods and services refund in mLeasing Sp. z o. o. for the fourth quarter of 2015. The audit did not identify any relevant irregularities.

Within the period from 4 to 25 January 2016, Director of the Social Insurance Institution (Zakład Ubezpieczeń Społecznych) conducted an inspection in mLocum S.A. concerning, i.a. the correctness and accuracy of calculating the social security contributions, reporting to the social insurance and health insurance for the years 2012, 2013 and 2014. The audit did not identify any relevant irregularities.

The tax authorities, may inspect at any time the books and records within 5 years subsequent to the reported tax year, and may impose additional tax assessments and penalties. The Management Board is not aware of any circumstances, which may give rise to a potential tax liability in this respect.