



Supplement A dated 9 April 2014
according to Section 16 para. 1 German Securities Prospectus Act (WpPG)
relating to the Base Prospectus for the issuance of Certificates, Warrants and Notes
dated 20 March 2014
as approved by the BaFin on 25 March 2014 in accordance with Section 13 para. 1
German Securities Prospectus Act (WpPG)

Supplement A dated 9 April 2014
according to Section 16 para. 1 German Securities Prospectus Act (WpPG)
relating to the Base Prospectus for the issuance of Certificates, Notes and Credit
Certificates dated 4 April 2014
as approved by the BaFin on 4 April 2014 in accordance with Section 13 para. 1 German
Securities Prospectus Act (WpPG)

In accordance with Section 16 para. 3 of the German Securities Prospectus Act (Wertpapierprospektgesetz), investors who have, in the course of an offer of securities to the public, already agreed to purchase or subscribe for the securities, before the publication of this Supplement, have the right, exercisable within two working days after the publication of the Supplement, to withdraw their acceptances, provided that the new factor, mistake or inaccuracy referred to in Section 16 para. 1 of the German Securities Prospectus Act arose before the final closing of the offer to the public and the delivery of the securities.

The right to withdraw is exercisable by notification to Deutsche Bank Aktiengesellschaft, Taunusanlage 12, 60325 Frankfurt am Main, Germany.

The new factor resulting in this Supplement applicable only for the Base Prospectus for the issuance of Certificates, Warrants and Notes dated 4 April 2014 is the correction of a wrong statement regarding the legal name of the rating-agency Fitch contained in the prospectus dated 4 April 2014 which has been approved on 4 April 2014.

The new factor resulting in this Supplement applicable only for the Base Prospectus for the issuance of Certificates, Warrants and Notes dated 20 March 2014 is the publication on 26 March 2014 by the Rating Agency Fitch regarding the change of the rating outlook assigned to Deutsche Bank and the correction of a wrong statement regarding the legal name of the rating-agency Fitch contained in the prospectus.

All other information contained in this Supplement are included for correction and/or updating purposes only and do not constitute a new factor or material inaccuracy within the meaning of Section 16 para 3 of the German Securities Prospectus Act.

This Supplement, taking effect from 9 April 2014, amends and corrects the information contained in the above mentioned prospectuses as follows:

I.

Only in the Base Prospectus for the issuance of Certificates, Warrants and Notes dated 4 April 2014 in Chapter „**A. Summary**“, Section “**B - Issuer**” Element “**B.17. Credit ratings assigned to the issuer or its debt securities**” the text contained in the right column in the first, second and third paragraph, excluding the table, shall be deleted and replaced as follows:



„Deutsche Bank is rated by Standard & Poor's Credit Market Services France S.A.S. ("S&P"), by Moody's Investors Service Ltd., London, United Kingdom ("Moody's") and by Fitch Limited ("Fitch", together with S&P and Moody's, the "Rating Agencies").

Each of the Rating Agencies is established in the European Community and is registered under Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 on credit rating agencies (as amended).

As of 9 April 2014 the following ratings were assigned to Deutsche Bank:¹

II.

Only in the Base Prospectus for the issuance of Certificates, Warrants and Notes dated 20 March 2014 in Chapter „**A. Summary**“, Section „**B - Issuer**“ Element „**B.17. Credit ratings assigned to the issuer or its debt securities**“ the table and the text contained in the right column shall be deleted and replaced as follows:

„Deutsche Bank is rated by Standard & Poor's Credit Market Services France S.A.S. ("S&P"), by Moody's Investors Service Ltd., London, United Kingdom ("Moody's") and by Fitch Limited ("Fitch", together with S&P and Moody's, the "Rating Agencies").

Each of the Rating Agencies is established in the European Community and is registered under Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 on credit rating agencies (as amended).

As of 9 April 2014 the following ratings were assigned to Deutsche Bank:²

<i>Rating-Agency</i>	<i>Long-term</i>	<i>Short-term</i>	<i>Outlook</i>
Moody's	A2	P-1	negative
S&P	A	A-1	stable
Fitch	A+	F1+	negative

III.

Only in the Base Prospectus for the issuance of Certificates, Warrants and Notes dated 20 March 2014 in chapter „**VI. Form of Final Terms**“ on page 285 the last paragraph shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

“In addition, the Base Prospectus dated 20 March 2014 shall be available free of charge at the registered office of the Issuer, Deutsche Bank AG, Grosse Gallusstrasse 10-14, 60311 Frankfurt am Main, its London Branch, at Winchester House, 1 Great Winchester Street, London EC2N 2DB, its Milan branch, Via Filippo Turati 27, 20121 Milan, Italy, its Portuguese branch, Rua Castilho, 20, 1250-069 Lisbon, Portugal, its Spanish branch, Paseo De La Castellana, 18, 28046 Madrid, Spain and its Zurich Branch, Uraniastrasse 9, PF 3604, CH-8021 Zurich, Switzerland (where it can also be ordered by telephone +41 44 227 3781 or fax +41 44 227 3084).”

¹ source: webpage of the Issuer <https://www.deutsche-bank.de/ir/de/content/ratings.htm> as of 9 April 2014

² source: webpage of the Issuer <https://www.deutsche-bank.de/ir/de/content/ratings.htm> as of 9 April 2014



IV.

Only in the Base Prospectus for the issuance of Certificates, Warrants and Notes dated 20 March 2014 a new chapter „**VIII. Additional information on Deutsche Bank**” with the following text shall be inserted:

„Additional information on Deutsche Bank can be found in the Registration document as well as in the consolidated annual financial statements of Deutsche Bank AG for the financial year ending 31 December 2013 (audited) and the financial statements and the management report (HGB) of Deutsche Bank AG for the financial year ending 31 December 2013 (audited).

Legal and Arbitration Proceedings

Below in alphabetical order described are legal proceedings that may as of 1 April 2014 have, or have had in the recent past, significant effects on the Group’s financial position or profitability.

City of Milan Matters

In January 2009, the City of Milan (the “City”) issued civil proceedings in the District Court of Milan against Deutsche Bank and three other banks (together the “Banks”) in relation to a 2005 bond issue by the City (the “Bond”) and a related swap transaction which was subsequently restructured several times between 2005 and 2007 (the “Swap”) (the Bond and Swap together, the “Transaction”). The City sought damages and/or other remedies on the grounds of alleged fraudulent and deceitful acts and alleged breach of advisory obligations. During March 2012, the City and the Banks agreed to discharge all existing civil claims between them in respect of the Transaction, with no admission of liability by the Banks. While some aspects of the Swap remain in place between Deutsche Bank and the City, others were terminated as part of the civil settlement. As a further condition of the civil settlement, the sums seized from the Banks by the Milan Prosecutor (in the case of Deutsche Bank, €25 million) were returned by the Prosecutor to the Banks, despite this seizure having been part of the trial described below. Deutsche Bank also received a small interest payment in respect of the seized sum.

In March 2010, at the Milan Prosecutor’s request, the Milan judge of the preliminary hearing approved the indictment of each of the Banks and certain of their employees (including two current employees of Deutsche Bank). The indictments of the employees were for alleged criminal offences relating to the Swap and subsequent restructuring, in particular fraud against a public authority. The Banks were charged with an administrative (non-criminal) offence of having systems and controls that did not prevent the employees’ alleged crimes. A first instance verdict was handed down on December 19, 2012. This verdict found all the Banks and certain employees, including the two Deutsche Bank employees, guilty of the charges against them. A reasoned judgment was handed down on February 3, 2013. Deutsche Bank and its employees filed appeals of this judgment in May 2013, and the appeals commenced on January 30, 2014. On March 7, 2014, the Milan Court of Appeal upheld all the grounds of appeal and quashed both the criminal convictions of the employees and the administrative liability of the Banks. The prosecutor has yet to decide whether to appeal to the Supreme Court.



Credit Default Swap Antitrust Matters

On July 1, 2013, the European Commission (EC) issued a Statement of Objections (the “SO”) against Deutsche Bank, Markit Group Limited (Markit), the International Swaps and Derivatives Association, Inc. (ISDA), and twelve other banks alleging anti-competitive conduct under Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) and Article 53 of the European Economic Area Agreement (the “EEA Agreement”). The SO sets forth preliminary conclusions of the EC that (i) attempts by certain entities to engage in exchange trading of unfunded credit derivatives were foreclosed by improper collective action in the period from 2006 through 2009, and (ii) the conduct of Markit, ISDA, Deutsche Bank and the twelve other banks constituted a single and continuous infringement of Article 101 of the TFEU and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement. If the EC finally concludes that infringement occurred, it may seek to impose fines and other remedial measures on Deutsche Bank, Markit, ISDA and the twelve other banks. Deutsche Bank filed a response contesting the EC’s preliminary conclusions in January 2014.

In re Credit Default Swaps Antitrust Litigation

Several putative civil actions have been filed in federal court in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York and the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois against Deutsche Bank and numerous other credit default swap (CDS) dealer banks. All of the complaints allege that the banks conspired to prevent the establishment of exchange traded CDS, with the effect of raising prices for over-the-counter CDS transactions, and seek to represent a class of individuals and entities located in the United States or abroad who, during a period from about October 2008 through the present, directly purchased CDS from or directly sold CDS to the defendants in the United States. On July 16, 2013, a motion was filed with the Joint Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to have all of the CDS civil actions consolidated for pretrial proceedings. On October 16, 2013, the Joint Panel transferred the CDS civil actions to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. An initial status conference was held on December 5, 2013. On December 13, 2013, the Court entered a Case Management Order stating that the CDS civil actions are consolidated for pretrial purposes. Lead plaintiffs filed their consolidated amended complaint on January 31, 2014. Defendants intend to file a motion to dismiss in March 2014.

Corporate Securities Matters

Deutsche Bank and Deutsche Bank Securities Inc. (“DBSI”) regularly act in the capacity of underwriter and sales agent for debt and equity securities of corporate issuers and are from time to time named as defendants in litigation commenced by investors relating to those securities.

Deutsche Bank and DBSI, along with numerous other financial institutions, have been sued in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in various actions in their capacity as underwriters and sales agents for debt and equity securities issued by American International Group, Inc. (“AIG”) between 2006 and 2008. On May 19, 2009, lead plaintiffs filed a consolidated putative securities class action pursuant to Sections 11, 12(a)(2), and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 and Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”). The underwriters and sales agents are not named in the Exchange Act claims. The complaint alleges, among other things, that the offering documents failed to reveal that AIG had substantial exposure to losses due to credit default swaps, that AIG’s real estate assets were overvalued, and that AIG’s financial statements did not conform to GAAP. The total amount of securities alleged to have been sold by the underwriter and sales agent defendants pursuant to the offerings at issue in the consolidated action is



U.S.\$ 27 billion. Deutsche Bank AG underwrote approximately U.S.\$ 550 million in AIG securities. DBSI underwrote approximately U.S.\$ 811 million in AIG securities. On April 1, 2011, lead plaintiffs filed a motion for class certification and defendants' oppositions were filed on May 24, 2012. Lead plaintiffs filed their reply brief on June 22, 2012. The Court held oral argument on the class certification motion on May 1, 2013. Fact discovery is also complete. Expert discovery has been deferred pending the Court's ruling on class certification. On January 30, 2014, the Court stayed the case until the Supreme Court renders its decision in *Halliburton*, a case involving unrelated parties but relating to the legal issue of class certification. The underwriter and sales agent defendants, including Deutsche Bank and DBSI, received a customary agreement to indemnify from AIG as issuer in connection with the offerings, upon which they have notified AIG that they are seeking indemnity.

DBSI, along with numerous other financial institutions, was named as a defendant in a putative class action lawsuit pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York relating to alleged misstatements and omissions in the registration statement of General Motors Company ("GM") in connection with GM's November 18, 2010 initial public offering ("IPO"). DBSI acted as an underwriter for the offering. Specifically, lead plaintiff alleges that the registration statement issued in connection with the IPO contained material misstatements and/or omissions. The original complaint was filed on June 29, 2012. Lead plaintiff was appointed on November 21, 2012, and lead plaintiff filed an amended complaint on February 1, 2013. A motion to dismiss has been fully briefed. The underwriters, including DBSI, received a customary agreement to indemnify from GM as issuer in connection with the offerings, upon which they have notified GM that they are seeking indemnity.

DBSI, along with other financial institutions, was named as a defendant in a putative class action lawsuit pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in April 2009 alleging material misstatements and/or omissions in the offering documents of General Electric Co.'s ("GE") October 2008 Common Stock Offering. DBSI acted as an underwriter in the offering. On July 29, 2009, the Court entered an order consolidating this action with others generally arising out of the same facts against GE and various company officers and directors. A consolidated amended complaint was filed on October 2, 2009. Defendants moved to dismiss the consolidated amended complaint on November 24, 2009, and, on June 9, 2010, the plaintiff filed a second amended complaint. Defendants moved to dismiss the second amended complaint on June 30, 2010, and the Court granted in part and denied in part that motion on January 12, 2012. On January 26, 2012, defendants moved for reconsideration regarding the claims which were not dismissed, and, on April 18, 2012, the Court granted reconsideration and dismissed the remaining claims against DBSI and the other underwriter defendants. Some claims against the GE-related defendants survived. The time for any appeal from dismissal of the claims against the underwriters will not begin to run until disposition of the remaining claims against the GE-related defendants. The underwriters, including DBSI, received a customary agreement to indemnify from GE as issuer in connection with the offerings, upon which they have notified GE that they are seeking indemnity. A settlement between GE and the plaintiffs has been reached and was approved by the Court on September 6, 2013. On October 3, 2013, a shareholder of GE filed a notice of appeal challenging the settlement which was withdrawn on March 11, 2014.

CO2 Emission Rights

The Frankfurt am Main Office of Public Prosecution (the "OPP") is investigating alleged value-added tax (VAT) fraud in connection with the trading of CO2 emission rights by certain trading firms, some of which also engaged in trading activity with Deutsche Bank. The OPP alleges that certain employees of Deutsche Bank knew that their counterparties were part of a fraudulent scheme to avoid VAT on transactions in CO2 emission rights, and it searched



Deutsche Bank's head office and London branch in April 2010 and issued various requests for documents. In December 2012, the OPP widened the scope of its investigation and again searched Deutsche Bank's head office. It alleges that certain employees deleted e-mails of suspects shortly before the 2010 search and failed to issue a suspicious activity report under the Anti-Money Laundering Act which, according to the OPP, was required. It also alleges that Deutsche Bank filed an incorrect VAT return for 2009, which was signed by two members of the Management Board, and incorrect monthly returns for September 2009 to February 2010. Deutsche Bank is cooperating with the OPP.

Credit Correlation

Certain regulatory authorities are investigating Deutsche Bank's bespoke credit correlation trading book and certain risks within that book, during the credit crisis. Issues being examined include the methodology used to value positions in the book as well as the robustness of controls governing the application of valuation methodologies. Deutsche Bank is cooperating with those investigations.

Esch Funds Litigation

Sal. Oppenheim jr. & Cie. AG & Co. KGaA ("Sal. Oppenheim") was prior to its acquisition by Deutsche Bank in 2010 involved in the marketing and financing of participations in closed end real-estate funds. These funds were structured as Civil Law Partnerships under German law. Usually, Josef Esch Fonds-Project GmbH performed the planning and project development. Sal. Oppenheim held an indirect interest in this company via a joint-venture. In relation to this business a number of civil claims have been filed against Sal. Oppenheim. Some but not all of these claims are also directed against former managing partners of Sal. Oppenheim and other individuals. The claims brought against Sal. Oppenheim relate to investments of originally approximately € 1.1 billion. The investors are seeking to unwind their fund participation and to be indemnified against potential losses and debt related to the investment. The claims are based in part on an alleged failure of Sal. Oppenheim to provide adequate information on related risks and other material aspects important for the investors' decision. The District Court Bonn dismissed two lawsuits against Sal. Oppenheim. The relevant plaintiffs filed appeals against these decisions. In another lawsuit the District Court Frankfurt held that Sal. Oppenheim must fully unwind the investment. Sal. Oppenheim has appealed this decision.

FX Investigations and Litigations

Deutsche Bank has received requests for information from certain regulatory authorities globally who are investigating trading in the foreign exchange market. The Bank is cooperating with those investigations. Relatedly, Deutsche Bank is conducting its own internal global review of foreign exchange trading. In connection with this review, the Bank has taken, and will continue to take, disciplinary action with regards to individuals if merited. Deutsche Bank is also named as a defendant in several putative class action complaints bringing antitrust claims relating to the alleged manipulation of foreign exchange rates.

Hiring Practices Inquiries

Certain regulatory authorities are examining Deutsche Bank's hiring practices in the Asia-Pacific region to determine if any candidates were hired on the basis of referrals from executives at governmental entities (including state-owned enterprises) in potential violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act or similar laws. Deutsche Bank is cooperating with these inquiries.



Hydro Dispute

Deutsche Bank was involved in legal proceedings with respect to a hydropower project in Albania. On the other side were two Italian companies, BEG SpA and Hydro Srl. BEG is Deutsche Bank's joint venture partner with respect to the project; Hydro was the joint venture vehicle (owned 55 % by BEG and 45 % by Deutsche Bank). The dispute centered around whether Deutsche Bank had an obligation to fund construction of the project in full. Deutsche Bank's position was that its sole funding obligation with respect to the project was to provide an equity injection of up to €35 million, which obligation it has fulfilled.

Initially, Deutsche Bank was defendant in an arbitration claim from Hydro in Italy for damages of €411 million for alleged failure to finance the construction of the project ("Rome 1"). In November 2011, the arbitration panel ruled that there was evidence of some (unspecified) further financing commitment on Deutsche Bank's part, and issued an award of approximately €29 million against Deutsche Bank. Deutsche Bank appealed to the Court of Appeal in Rome for the award to be set aside. The Court affirmed the award in July 2013.

Deutsche Bank responded to the Rome 1 arbitration by bringing a claim against BEG in an International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) arbitration in Paris. The ICC tribunal's award, which was issued in April 2013, confirmed inter alia that Deutsche Bank had fulfilled its obligations in respect of the project to date and that (contrary to the findings of the Italian arbitration panel) no further financing commitment exists on the Bank's part. The ICC tribunal also dismissed BEG's counterclaim of €242 million in full.

In the fourth quarter of 2012, Hydro launched a new arbitration against Deutsche Bank in Italy ("Rome 2"). Hydro sought damages of approximately €490 million in respect of historic losses, with a further €200 million in respect of future losses should the concession to build the power plant be revoked. In August 2013 the Rome 2 panel issued an award of €396 million against Deutsche Bank.

In June 2013, Deutsche Bank commenced a new arbitration before the ICC tribunal in Paris, seeking inter alia recovery of any sums paid by the Bank in connection with the Rome 1 or Rome 2 arbitrations.

On October 30, 2013, Deutsche Bank entered into a settlement with BEG SpA and Hydro Srl resolving all outstanding proceedings and disputes between the parties. The financial terms of the settlement were not material to Deutsche Bank.

IBEW Local 90 Class Action

Deutsche Bank and certain of its officers have been named as defendants in a putative class action pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York brought on behalf of all persons who acquired Deutsche Bank ordinary shares between January 3, 2007 and January 16, 2009 (the "class period"). In an amended complaint, plaintiff alleges that during the class period, the value of Deutsche Bank's securities was inflated due to alleged misstatements or omissions on Deutsche Bank's part regarding the potential exposure to Deutsche Bank arising out of the MortgageIT, Inc. acquisition, and regarding the potential exposure arising from Deutsche Bank's RMBS (residential mortgage-backed securities) and CDO (collateralized debt obligations) portfolio during the class period. Claims are asserted under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and Rule 10b-5 thereunder. Defendants moved to dismiss the amended complaint. By decision dated March 27, 2013, the Court largely denied the motion to dismiss as to Deutsche Bank and all but one of the individual defendants. The Court dismissed all claims by class members who acquired



shares outside the United States. Plaintiffs moved for class action certification on July 1, 2013. Following an evidentiary hearing, the Court issued its decision on October 29, 2013 denying Plaintiffs' motion. On January 2, 2014, the parties informed the Court that a settlement in principle had been reached that will provide for dismissal of the action with prejudice. In response, on January 6, 2014, the Court ordered that the action be discontinued without costs to any party and without prejudice to restore the action if such application is made by February 3, 2014. On January 29, 2014, the parties informed the Court that a final settlement had been completed and requested the Court to provide a dismissal of the action with prejudice. The financial terms of this settlement are not material to Deutsche Bank.

Interbank Offered Rates Matters

Deutsche Bank has received subpoenas and requests for information from various regulatory and law enforcement agencies in Europe, North America and Asia Pacific in connection with industry-wide investigations concerning the setting of London Interbank Offered Rate (LIBOR), Euro Interbank Offered Rate (EURIBOR), Tokyo Interbank Offered Rate (TIBOR) and other interbank offered rates. Deutsche Bank is cooperating with these investigations.

The investigations underway have the potential to result in the imposition of significant financial penalties and other consequences for the Bank.

On December 4, 2013, Deutsche Bank announced that it had reached a settlement with the European Commission as part of a collective settlement to resolve the European Commission's investigations in relation to anticompetitive conduct in the trading of Euro interest rate derivatives and Yen interest rate derivatives. Under the terms of the settlement agreement, Deutsche Bank agreed to pay € 466 million for the Euro interest rate derivatives and € 259 million for the Yen interest rate derivatives matters, respectively, or € 725 million in total. The settlement amount was already substantially reflected in Deutsche Bank's existing litigation reserves, and no material additional reserves were necessary. The settlement amount reflects the high market share held by Deutsche Bank in certain of the markets investigated by the European Commission. Deutsche Bank remains exposed to civil litigation and further regulatory action relating to these benchmarks.

In the period from mid-2012 to early 2014, four financial institutions entered into settlements with the U.K. Financial Services Authority, U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission and U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). While the terms of the various settlements differed, they all involved significant financial penalties and regulatory consequences. For example, two financial institutions' settlements included a Deferred Prosecution Agreement, pursuant to which the DOJ agreed to defer prosecution of criminal charges against the applicable entity provided that the financial institution satisfies the terms of the Deferred Prosecution Agreement. The terms of the other two financial institutions' settlements included Non-Prosecution Agreements, pursuant to which the DOJ agreed not to file criminal charges against the entities so long as certain conditions are met. In addition, affiliates of two of the financial institutions agreed to plead guilty to a crime in a United States court for related conduct.

A number of civil actions, including putative class actions, are pending in federal court in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (SDNY) against Deutsche Bank and numerous other banks. All but two of these actions were filed on behalf of parties who allege that they held or transacted in U.S. Dollar LIBOR-based derivatives or other financial instruments and sustained losses as a result of purported collusion or manipulation by the defendants relating to the setting of U.S. Dollar LIBOR. With two exceptions, all of the civil actions pending in the SDNY concerning U.S. Dollar LIBOR are being coordinated as part



of a multidistrict litigation (U.S. Dollar LIBOR MDL). In March 2013, the District Court dismissed the federal and state antitrust claims, claims asserted under the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) and certain state law claims that had been asserted in six amended complaints. Appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit were dismissed as premature. Various motions are pending before the District Court. Additional complaints relating to the alleged manipulation of U.S. Dollar LIBOR have been filed in, removed to, or transferred to the SDNY and are being coordinated as part of the U.S. Dollar LIBOR MDL. These additional actions have been stayed. One other action against Deutsche Bank and other banks concerning U.S. Dollar LIBOR was recently removed to the SDNY and defendants have requested that it be coordinated as part of the U.S. Dollar LIBOR MDL. An additional action concerning U.S. Dollar LIBOR is independently pending in the SDNY and is subject to a pending motion to dismiss.

A putative class action was filed against Deutsche Bank and other banks concerning the alleged manipulation of Yen LIBOR and Euroyen TIBOR. Motions to dismiss have been fully briefed and are scheduled for argument. Deutsche Bank was added as a defendant in an amended complaint filed in a putative class action concerning the alleged manipulation of Euribor. Defendants' time to respond to that complaint has been stayed pending the filing of a further amended complaint. Claims for damages in these cases have been asserted under various legal theories, including violations of the Commodity Exchange Act, federal and state antitrust laws, the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, and other federal and state laws.

Kaupthing CLN Claims

In June 2012, Kaupthing hf (acting through its Winding-up Committee) issued Icelandic law clawback claims for approximately €509 million (plus interest) against Deutsche Bank in both Iceland and England. The claims relate to leveraged credit linked notes, referencing Kaupthing, issued by Deutsche Bank to two British Virgin Island Special Purpose Vehicles ("SPVs") in 2008. The SPVs were ultimately owned by high net worth individuals. Kaupthing claims to have funded the SPVs and alleges that Deutsche Bank was or should have been aware that Kaupthing itself was economically exposed in the transactions. It is claimed that the transactions are voidable by Kaupthing on a number of alternative grounds, including the ground that the transactions were improper because one of the alleged purposes of the transactions was to allow Kaupthing to influence the market in its own CDS (credit default swap) spreads and thereby its listed bonds. Additionally, in November 2012, an English law claim (with allegations similar to those featured in the Icelandic law claims) was commenced by Kaupthing against Deutsche Bank in London. Deutsche Bank filed its defense in the Icelandic proceedings in late February 2013 and continues to defend the claims.

Kirch Litigation

In May 2002, Dr. Leo Kirch personally and as an assignee of two entities of the former Kirch Group, i.e., PrintBeteiligungs GmbH and the group holding company TaurusHolding GmbH & Co. KG, initiated legal action against Dr. Rolf-E. Breuer and Deutsche Bank alleging that a statement made by Dr. Breuer (then the Spokesman of Deutsche Bank's Management Board) regarding the Kirch Group in an interview with Bloomberg television on February 4, 2002, was in breach of laws and resulted in financial damage.

On January 24, 2006, the German Federal Supreme Court sustained the action for the declaratory judgment only in respect of the claims assigned by PrintBeteiligungs GmbH. Such action and judgment did not require a proof of any loss caused by the statement made in the interview. PrintBeteiligungs GmbH is the only company of the Kirch Group which was a



borrower of Deutsche Bank. Claims by Dr. Kirch personally and by Taurus-Holding GmbH & Co. KG were dismissed. In May 2007, Dr. Kirch filed an action for payment of approximately € 1.3 billion plus interest as assignee of PrintBeteiligungs GmbH against Deutsche Bank and Dr. Breuer. On February 22, 2011, the District Court Munich I dismissed the lawsuit in its entirety. Dr. Kirch filed an appeal against the decision.

On December 31, 2005, KGL Pool GmbH filed a lawsuit against Deutsche Bank and Dr. Breuer. The lawsuit was based on alleged claims assigned from various subsidiaries of the former Kirch Group. KGL Pool GmbH sought a declaratory judgment to the effect that Deutsche Bank and Dr. Breuer are jointly and severally liable for damages as a result of the interview statement and the behavior of Deutsche Bank in respect of several subsidiaries of the Kirch Group. In December 2007, KGL Pool GmbH supplemented this lawsuit by a motion for payment of approximately € 2.0 billion plus interest as compensation for the purported damages which two subsidiaries of the former Kirch Group allegedly suffered as a result of the statement by Dr. Breuer. On March 31, 2009, the District Court Munich I dismissed the lawsuit in its entirety. KGL Pool GmbH appealed the decision. On December 14, 2012, the appellate court altered the judgment by District Court Munich I and held that Deutsche Bank and Dr. Breuer are liable for damages assigned by one subsidiary of the former Kirch Group and claimed under the motion for payment, rendered a declaratory judgment in favor of certain subsidiaries and dismissed the claims assigned by certain other subsidiaries. On March 12, 2013, the appellate court handed down the written judgment containing the reasons for its decisions. Deutsche Bank and Dr. Breuer filed a request for leave to appeal with the German Federal Supreme Court. The appellate court asked a valuation expert to opine on the market value of ProSiebenSat.1 shares held by Kirch Media before the interview to facilitate its decision on the alleged damages underlying the payment claim.

On February 20, 2014, at a court hearing before the Munich appellate court, the heir of Dr. Leo Kirch, as plaintiff in the Printbeteiligungs case, and KGL Pool GmbH on the one side and Deutsche Bank on the other side entered into a settlement agreement pursuant to which Deutsche Bank agreed to pay € 775 million (plus interest at the rate of 5 % p.a. since March 24, 2011 and costs in the amount of € 40 million) in consideration for the plaintiffs withdrawing their claims against Deutsche Bank.

KOSPI Index Unwind Matters

Following the decline of the Korea Composite Stock Price Index 200 (“KOSPI 200”) in the closing auction on November 11, 2010 by approximately 2.7 %, the Korean Financial Supervisory Service (“FSS”) commenced an investigation and expressed concerns that the fall in the KOSPI 200 was attributable to a sale by Deutsche Bank of a basket of stocks, worth approximately € 1.6 billion, that was held as part of an index arbitrage position on the KOSPI 200. On February 23, 2011, the Korean Financial Services Commission, which oversees the work of the FSS, reviewed the FSS’ findings and recommendations and resolved to take the following actions: (i) to file a criminal complaint to the Korean Prosecutor’s Office for alleged market manipulation against five employees of the Deutsche Bank group and Deutsche Bank’s subsidiary Deutsche Securities Korea Co. (DSK) for vicarious liability; and (ii) to impose a suspension of six months, commencing April 1, 2011 and ending September 30, 2011, of DSK’s business for proprietary trading of cash equities and listed derivatives and DMA (direct market access) cash equities trading, and the requirement that DSK suspend the employment of one named employee for six months. There was an exemption to the business suspension which permitted DSK to continue acting as liquidity provider for existing derivatives linked securities. On August 19, 2011, the Korean Prosecutor’s Office announced its decision to indict DSK and four employees of the Deutsche Bank group on charges of spot/futures linked market manipulation. The criminal trial commenced in January 2012. A verdict in respect of DSK and one of the four indicted employees may be delivered during



2014. In addition, a number of civil actions have been filed in Korean courts against Deutsche Bank and DSK by certain parties who allege they incurred losses as a consequence of the fall in the KOSPI 200 on November 11, 2010. The claimants are seeking damages with an aggregate claim amount of not less than €220 million (at present exchange rates) plus interest and costs. These litigations are at various stages of proceedings, with verdicts in some actions possible during 2014.

Monte Dei Paschi

In February 2013 Banca Monte Dei Paschi Di Siena (“MPS”) issued civil proceedings in Italy against Deutsche Bank AG alleging that Deutsche Bank fraudulently or negligently assisted former MPS senior management in an accounting fraud on MPS, by undertaking repo transactions with MPS and “Santorini”, a wholly owned SPV of MPS, which helped MPS defer losses on a previous transaction undertaken with Deutsche Bank. MPS claimed at least €500 million in damages. Subsequently, in July 2013, the Fondazione Monte Dei Paschi, MPS’ largest shareholder, also issued civil proceedings in Italy for damages based on substantially the same facts. In December 2013, Deutsche Bank reached an agreement with MPS in relation to the transactions that resolves the civil proceedings by MPS. The civil proceedings by the Fondazione Monte Dei Paschi remain pending.

There is also an ongoing criminal investigation by the Siena Public Prosecutor into the transactions and certain unrelated transactions entered into by a number of other international banks with MPS. No charges have yet been brought. Separately, Deutsche Bank has also received requests for information in relation to the transactions from certain regulators, with whom it is cooperating.

Mortgage-Related and Asset-Backed Securities Matters

Deutsche Bank, along with certain affiliates (collectively referred in these paragraphs to as “Deutsche Bank”), have received subpoenas and requests for information from certain regulators and government entities concerning its activities regarding the origination, purchase, securitization, sale and/or trading of mortgage loans, residential mortgage-backed securities (RMBS), collateralized debt obligations, other asset-backed securities, commercial paper and credit derivatives. Deutsche Bank is cooperating fully in response to those subpoenas and requests for information.

Deutsche Bank has been named as defendant in numerous civil litigations in various roles as issuer or underwriter in offerings of RMBS and other asset-backed securities. These cases include putative class action suits, actions by individual purchasers of securities, actions by trustees on behalf of RMBS trusts, and actions by insurance companies that guaranteed payments of principal and interest for particular tranches of securities offerings. Although the allegations vary by lawsuit, these cases generally allege that the RMBS offering documents contained material misrepresentations and omissions, including with regard to the underwriting standards pursuant to which the underlying mortgage loans were issued, or assert that various representations or warranties relating to the loans were breached at the time of origination.

Deutsche Bank and several current or former employees were named as defendants in a putative class action commenced on June 27, 2008, relating to two Deutsche Bank-issued RMBS offerings. Following a mediation, the court has approved a settlement of the case.



Deutsche Bank is a defendant in putative class actions relating to its role, along with other financial institutions, as underwriter of RMBS issued by IndyMac MBS, Inc. and Novastar Mortgage Corporation. These cases are in discovery.

On December 18, 2013, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York dismissed the claims against Deutsche Bank in the putative class action relating to RMBS issued by Residential Accredited Loans, Inc. and its affiliates.

On April 17, 2013, Bank of America announced that it had reached a settlement in principle to dismiss various class action claims, which include the class action claims brought against underwriters, including Deutsche Bank, relating to RMBS issued by Countrywide Financial Corporation. Following preliminary and final fairness hearings, on December 17, 2013, the court entered a final judgment and order of dismissal with prejudice. The settlement did not require any payment by unaffiliated underwriters, including Deutsche Bank.

Deutsche Bank is a defendant in various non-class action lawsuits and arbitrations by alleged purchasers of, and counterparties involved in transactions relating to, RMBS, and their affiliates, including Assured Guaranty Municipal Corporation, Aozora Bank, Ltd., Bayerische Landesbank, Commerzbank AG, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (as conservator for Colonial Bank, Franklin Bank S.S.B., Guaranty Bank, Citizens National Bank and Strategic Capital Bank), the Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston, the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, the Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle, the Federal Housing Finance Agency (as conservator for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac), HSBC Bank USA, National Association (as trustee for certain RMBS trusts), John Hancock, Knights of Columbus, Landesbank Baden-Württemberg, Mass Mutual Life Insurance Company, Moneygram Payment Systems, Inc., Phoenix Light SF Limited (as purported assignee of claims of special purpose vehicles created and/or managed by WestLB AG), Royal Park Investments (as purported assignee of claims of a special-purpose vehicle created to acquire certain assets of Fortis Bank), Sealink Funding Ltd. (as purported assignee of claims of special purpose vehicles created and/or managed by Sachsen Landesbank and its subsidiaries), The Charles Schwab Corporation, Triaxx Prime CDO 2006-1 Ltd., Triaxx Prime CDO 2006-1 LLC, Triaxx Prime CDO 2006-2 Ltd., Triaxx Prime CDO 2006-2 LLC, Triaxx Prime CDO 2007-1 Ltd. and Triaxx Prime CDO 2007-1 LLC. These civil litigations and arbitrations are in various stages up through discovery.

In the actions against Deutsche Bank solely as an underwriter of other issuers' RMBS offerings, Deutsche Bank has contractual rights to indemnification from the issuers, but those indemnity rights may in whole or in part prove effectively unenforceable where the issuers are now or may in the future be in bankruptcy or otherwise defunct.

On December 20, 2013, Deutsche Bank announced that it reached an agreement to resolve certain residential mortgage-backed securities litigation with the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) as conservator for the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (the GSEs). As part of the agreement, Deutsche Bank paid € 1.4 billion. The settlement included dismissal of claims brought against Deutsche Bank in the United States Federal Court for the Southern District of New York relating to approximately U.S. \$ 14.3 billion of RMBS purchased by the GSEs that were issued, sponsored and/or underwritten by Deutsche Bank and an agreement to resolve claims brought by or at the direction of the FHFA and/or the GSEs seeking the repurchase of mortgage loans contained in RMBS purchased by the GSEs. The settlement did not resolve two matters brought by the FHFA against Deutsche Bank as underwriter of RMBS issued by Countrywide Financial Corporation and Societe Generale and/or their affiliates. As underwriter, Deutsche Bank received a customary agreement of indemnity from Countrywide Financial Corporation and Societe Generale and/or their affiliates. On February 27, 2014, the FHFA and Societe



Generale announced that they reached a settlement of the action concerning RMBS issued by Societe Generale. The settlement included a release of the claims asserted against all defendants in that action, including Deutsche Bank. The settlement did not require any payment by Deutsche Bank.

On February 6, 2012, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York issued an order dismissing claims brought by Dexia SA/NV and Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America and their affiliates, and on January 4, 2013, the court issued an opinion explaining the basis for this order. The court dismissed some of the claims with prejudice and granted the plaintiffs leave to replead other claims. The plaintiffs repleaded the claims dismissed without prejudice by filing a new complaint on February 4, 2013. On July 17, 2013, pursuant to the terms of separate settlement agreements, Dexia SA/NV and Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America and their affiliates dismissed the lawsuits that had been filed against Deutsche Bank. The financial terms of the settlements are not material to Deutsche Bank.

On July 16, 2012, the Minnesota District Court dismissed with prejudice without leave to replead claims by Moneygram Payment Systems, Inc., which the plaintiffs have appealed. On January 13, 2013, Moneygram filed a summons with notice in New York State Supreme Court seeking to assert claims similar to those dismissed in Minnesota. On June 17, 2013, Moneygram filed an amended summons with notice and complaint in New York State Supreme Court. On July 22, 2013, the Minnesota Court of Appeals affirmed the dismissal of Deutsche Bank AG, but reversed the dismissal of Deutsche Bank Securities Inc. On October 15, 2013, the Minnesota Supreme Court denied Deutsche Bank Securities Inc.'s petition for writ of certiorari. Deutsche Bank has filed a petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Supreme Court.

Pursuant to terms of settlement agreements, litigations filed by Allstate Insurance Company, Cambridge Placement Investments Management Inc., Stichting Pensionfonds ABP, West Virginia Investment Management Board, The Union Central Life Insurance Company and The Western and Southern Life Insurance Co. were dismissed. The financial terms of each of these settlements are not material to Deutsche Bank.

Deutsche Bank has entered into agreements with certain entities that have threatened to assert claims against Deutsche Bank in connection with various RMBS offerings and other related products to toll the relevant statutes of limitations. It is possible that these potential claims may have a material impact on Deutsche Bank. In addition, Deutsche Bank has entered into settlement agreements with some of these entities, the financial terms of which are not material to Deutsche Bank.

Ocala Litigation

Deutsche Bank is a secured creditor of Ocala Funding LLC ("Ocala"), a commercial paper vehicle sponsored by Taylor Bean & Whitaker Mortgage Corp. ("Taylor Bean"), which ceased mortgage lending operations and filed for bankruptcy protection in August 2009. Bank of America is the trustee, collateral agent, custodian and depository agent for Ocala. Deutsche Bank commenced a civil litigation in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York against Bank of America for breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, and contractual indemnity resulting from Bank of America's failure to secure and safeguard cash and mortgage loans that secured Deutsche Bank's commercial paper investment. On March 23, 2011, the trial court denied in part and granted in part Bank of America's motion to dismiss the complaint. On October 1, 2012, Deutsche Bank amended its first complaint against Bank of America, to assert additional claims for breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty (which



includes a claim related to Bank of America's conversion of mortgages), negligence, negligent misrepresentation, unjust enrichment, and other tort and equitable claims. On June 6, 2013, the trial court granted Bank of America's motion to dismiss the additional claims asserted by Deutsche Bank in its second amended complaint and on December 9, 2013 denied Deutsche Bank's request seeking leave to amend its complaint against Bank of America to include the dismissed claims. This litigation is in discovery.

On December 29, 2011, Deutsche Bank commenced a civil litigation in Circuit Court of the 11th Judicial Circuit in Miami Dade County, Florida for professional malpractice and negligent misrepresentation against Deloitte & Touche LLP, the auditors of Taylor Bean's financial statements, which were consolidated with certain subsidiaries, including wholly owned subsidiary Ocala. On March 20, 2012, the court denied Deloitte & Touche LLP's motion to dismiss. This case has been settled to the mutual satisfaction of the parties.

Parmalat Litigation

Following the bankruptcy of the Italian company Parmalat, prosecutors in Parma conducted a criminal investigation against various bank employees, including employees of Deutsche Bank, and brought charges of fraudulent bankruptcy against a number of Deutsche Bank employees and others. The trial commenced in September 2009 and is ongoing.

Certain retail bondholders and shareholders have alleged civil liability against Deutsche Bank in connection with the above-mentioned criminal proceedings. Deutsche Bank has made a formal settlement offer to those retail investors who have asserted claims against Deutsche Bank. This offer has been accepted by some of the retail investors. The outstanding claims will be heard during the criminal trial process.

In January 2011, a group of institutional investors (bondholders and shareholders) commenced a civil claim for damages, in an aggregate amount of approximately € 130 million plus interest and costs, in the Milan courts against various international and Italian banks, including Deutsche Bank and Deutsche Bank S.p.A., on allegations of cooperation with Parmalat in the fraudulent placement of securities and of deepening the insolvency of Parmalat. Hearings on a preliminary application (made for preliminary matters, including jurisdiction) brought by the defendant banks have taken place and the court has reserved judgment and ordered the case to proceed on the merits. Deutsche Bank has petitioned the Italian Supreme Court for a final assessment of the jurisdiction argument.

Sebastian Holdings Litigation

Deutsche Bank is in litigation in the United Kingdom and the United States with Sebastian Holdings Inc., a Turks and Caicos company ("SHI"). The dispute arose in October 2008 when SHI accumulated trading losses and subsequently failed to meet margin calls issued by Deutsche Bank.

The U.K. action was brought by Deutsche Bank to recover approximately U.S.\$ 246 million owed by SHI after the termination of two sets of master trading agreements with SHI. In the U.K. action against SHI, the trial court (upheld by the Court of Appeal) held that it had jurisdiction over Deutsche Bank's suit and rejected SHI's claim that the U.K. was an inconvenient forum for the case to be heard.

As a counterclaim against Deutsche Bank in the U.K., SHI duplicated aspects of the U.S. claim (described below) in the U.K. proceedings. The amount of the U.K. pleaded counterclaim was not fully specified and elements may have been duplicative, but the pleaded



claim was for at least NOK 8.28 billion (around € 1.0 billion or U.S.\$ 1.38 billion at recent exchange rates, which do not necessarily equate to the rates applicable to the claim). Substantial consequential loss claims were pleaded in addition based primarily on the profits which SHI claimed it would have made on the moneys allegedly lost. The total quantum of SHI's alleged losses remains unclear, but SHI's expert has calculated losses claimed (including consequential losses) as potentially amounting to NOK 44.1 billion (around U.S.\$ 7.35 billion or € 5.33 billion at recent exchange rates, which do not necessarily equate to the rates applicable to the claim) plus sums associated with the currency in which damages are claimed (NOK) and interest. SHI also brought other claims including for restitution and declaratory relief.

The trial in the English court began in April 2013 and judgment was handed down in November 2013. The English court found SHI liable to Deutsche Bank for the amount of approximately U.S.\$ 236 million, plus interest, plus 85 % of costs, including an interim award of GBP 32 million, in respect of Deutsche Bank's claim and denied SHI's counterclaims, holding that SHI was not entitled to any recovery. In December 2013 Deutsche Bank commenced action in the English court against Mr. Alexander Vik (SHI's sole shareholder and director) personally in respect of the GBP 32 million interim costs award.

On December 20, 2013, SHI filed an application for permission to appeal portions of the trial court judgment with the Court of Appeal in England.

The U.S. action is a damages claim brought by SHI against Deutsche Bank in New York State court, arising out of the same circumstances as Deutsche Bank's suit against SHI in the U.K. and seeking damages of at least U.S.\$ 2.5 billion in an amended complaint filed January 10, 2011. SHI's claims largely relate to allegations that Deutsche Bank breached certain agreements and made improper margin calls. The trial court denied SHI's request to enjoin Deutsche Bank's suit in the U.K. The trial court denied Deutsche Bank's motion to dismiss or stay the U.S. action in favor of the U.K. action, while granting Deutsche Bank's motion to dismiss SHI's tort claims but not its contract and quasi-contractual claims. The New York Appellate Division affirmed the trial court's decision, and the amended complaint was filed after the Appellate Division decision. Deutsche Bank moved to dismiss certain of the claims alleged in the amended complaint. The trial court granted Deutsche Bank's motion to dismiss SHI's tort claims, certain of its contract and quasi-contract claims, and its claims for punitive damages. On July 2, 2013, the Appellate Division affirmed the trial court's ruling, and on October 15, 2013, the Appellate Division denied SHI's motion for leave to appeal to the New York Court of Appeals. On July 30, 2013, SHI informed the trial court of its intention to file a motion seeking leave to file a further amended complaint, but it has not yet filed such a motion. Discovery in the U.S. action is scheduled to close on April 4, 2014, and dispositive motions are due to be filed by May 16, 2014. No trial date has been set.

In November and December 2013, Deutsche Bank commenced actions in New York and Connecticut seeking to enforce the English judgment against SHI and Mr. Vik. In addition, Deutsche Bank brought claims in New York against SHI, Mr. Vik, and other defendants, including Mr. Vik's wife, Carrie Vik, and a family trust, for fraudulent transfers that stripped SHI of assets in October 2008.

Trust Preferred Securities Litigation

Deutsche Bank and certain of its affiliates and officers were the subject of a consolidated putative class action, filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, asserting claims under the federal securities laws on behalf of persons who purchased certain trust preferred securities issued by Deutsche Bank and its affiliates between October



2006 and May 2008. Claims are asserted under Sections 11, 12(a)(2), and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 that registration statements and prospectuses for such securities contained material misstatements and omissions. An amended and consolidated class action complaint was filed on January 25, 2010. On August 19, 2011, the court granted in part and denied in part the defendants' motion to dismiss. Following this, plaintiffs filed a second amended complaint, which did not include claims based on the October 2006 issuance of securities. On defendants' motion for reconsideration, the court on August 10, 2012 dismissed the second amended complaint with prejudice. Plaintiffs sought reconsideration of that dismissal. On May 15, 2013, the court denied plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration. On June 13, 2013, plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal with the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Defendants moved to dismiss the appeal as untimely. That motion was denied. Plaintiffs filed their appellate brief on December 10, 2013. Defendants filed a brief in response to Plaintiffs' appellate brief on March 10, 2014.

U.S. Embargoes-Related Matters

Deutsche Bank has received requests for information from regulatory agencies concerning its historical processing of U.S. Dollar payment orders through U.S. financial institutions for parties from countries subject to U.S. embargo laws and as to whether such processing complied with U.S. and state laws. Deutsche Bank is cooperating with the regulatory agencies.

ZAO FC Eurokommerz

On December 17, 2013, the liquidator of ZAO FC Eurokommerz commenced proceedings in the Arbitrazh Court of the City of Moscow against Deutsche Bank. The claim amounts to approximately € 210 million and relates to the repayment of a RUB 6.25 billion bridge loan facility extended to ZAO FC Eurokommerz on August 21, 2007. The bridge loan was repaid in full on December 21, 2007. ZAO FC Eurokommerz filed for bankruptcy on July 31, 2009. The liquidator alleges, amongst other things, (i) that Deutsche Bank must have known that ZAO FC Eurokommerz was in financial difficulties at the time of repayment and (ii) that the bridge loan was repaid from the proceeds of a securitization transaction which was found to be invalid and consequently the proceeds should not have been available to repay the bridge loan. The first instance hearing on the merits of the claim has been postponed until April 8, 2014."

V.

The "**Table of Contents**" shall be amended.

Frankfurt am Main, 9 April 2014

Deutsche Bank
Aktiengesellschaft