|  **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **8-2-2017** | **16-CV-02400** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Westchester Putnam Counties Heavy & Highway Laborers Local 60 Benefits Funds v. Brixmor Property Group, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Michael Carroll, Michael Pappagallo, and Steven Splain**The Complaint alleges that throughout the class period, Brixmor’s most senior officers deliberately falsified one of the Company’s most important publicly-reported financial metrics. Specifically, the Complaint alleges that Defendants fraudulently manipulated Brixmor’s quarterly same property net operating income, falsely portraying the growth in the metric as consistent and stable when in reality it fluctuated. The Complaint further alleges that Brixmor’s stock price was artificially inflated as a result of Defendants’ false and misleading statements, and that Brixmor’s stock price declined when the truth regarding Defendants’ alleged misrepresentations was revealed. | **12-6-2017** | **For more inforamtion write to:****Saxena White****Lester R. Hooker****5200 Town Center Circle****Suite 601****Boca Raton, FL 33486** |
| **8-7-2017** | **16-CV-01958** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Everett Castillo, Linda Castillo, Nicholas Dattoma, Freda Land, Wendy Tran, and Steve Wilk v. Seagate Technology LLC**Plaintiffs allege that certain Employees were informed that unknown individuals had filed fraudulent tax returns in their names with the Internal Revenue Service, and state taxing authorities. Plaintiffs also allege that certain of those Employees learned that the fraudulent tax returns were jointly filed, on behalf of themselves and their spouses, and included their spouses’ Social Security number. Plaintiffs claim that Seagate did not adequately protect their personal information, and that they were injured as a result of the Data Incident. | **Not set yet**Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more information call:****1 866-677-2607 (Ph.)** |
| **8-7-2017** | **13-CV-7789** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Foreign Exchange Benchmark Rates Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: The Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi UFJ, Ltd.; Morgan Stanley, Morgan Stanley & Co., LLC, and Morgan Stanley & Co., International PLC; RBC Capital Markets LLC; Société Générale; and Standard Chartered Bank (collectively, the “Settling Defendants)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants conspired to fix FX Benchmark Rates paid by members of the Settlement Classes. FX Benchmark Rates are rates that are published at certain times during the day and are prices at which Defendants offered to, and did, transact with members of the Settlement Classes. The most widely used aspect of the FX Benchmark Rates are the WM/Reuters Closing Spot Rates, which, for the most widely traded currency pairs, were set at 4:00 p.m. London time using the median price of actual trades executed in the market on certain venues between 3:59:30 p.m. and 4:00:30 p.m. London time. Class Plaintiffs allege Defendants shared confidential order and trade information to coordinate their trading positions and trading strategy to manipulate and fix the FX Benchmark Rates. Plaintiffs also allege that Defendants conspired to fix the spreads that Defendants quoted to members of the Settlement Classes. As described in the Third Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint (“Complaint”), spreads are the difference between the rate at which aDefendant indicated it would buy a currency and the rate at which a Defendant would sell a currency. Class Plaintiffs allege that Defendants discussed and agreed upon spreads through communications in chat rooms and other means. The alleged conspiracy to fix spreads is alleged to have reduced competition in the FX market and artificially increased the spread, with the result that Defendants bought currency at a lower price than they would have absent the alleged conspiracy, sold currency at a higher price than they would have absent the alleged conspiracy, and quoted less competitive spreads than they would have absent the alleged collusion. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Christopher M. Burke****Scott+Scott****Attorneys at Law, LLP****707 Broadway****Suite 1000****San Diego, CA 92101****619 233-4565 (Ph.)****cburke@scott-scott.com** |
| **8-7-2017** | **14-CV-06412** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Mayra Casas, Julio Fernandez v. Victoria’s Secret Stores, LLC**Plaintiffs allege multiple violations of California wage-and-hour laws by Victoria’s Secret Stores, LLC, for: (1) failure to pay reported time pay for regular shifts; (2) failure to pay reported time pay for “call-in” shifts; (3) failure to pay for all time worked; (4) failure to maintain required business records; (5) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; (6) unfair business practices.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Marlin & Saltzman****Stephen P. O’Dell****29800 Agoura Road****Suite 210****Agoura Hills, CA 91301****818 991-8080 (Ph.)****818 991-8081 (Fax)** |
| **8-8-2017** | **17-CV-01090** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Chepiga v. Conair Corp.**The lawsuit concerns Conair Corporation’s recall of the Cuisinart machines’ riveted blades. Some users have reported that when using the Cuisinart machines, the riveted blade could crack over time, causing portions of the blade to detach. The lawsuit claims that Conair promoted the Cuisinart machines as functional when in fact they did not function as claimed, that the machines lost value when consumers had to stop using the riveted blades, and that Conair violated express and implied warranties. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:****Paul, Weiss Rifkind, Wharton**  **& Garrison LLP****Lewis R. Clayton****James H. Borod****1285 Avenue of the Americas****New York, NY 10019****lclayton@paulweiss.com****jborod@paulweiss.com** |
| **8-10-2017** | **15-CV-01596** | **(W.D. Pa.)** | **Hartman v. Medicredit, Inc.**This lawsuit claims that Medicredit, Inc. (“MCI”) violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (“FDCPA”) by sending consumers written collection communications, which displayed the consumer’s account number through the glassine window of the enclosing envelope. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Ari Marcus****Marcus & Zelman LLC****1500 Allaire Avenue Suite 101****Ocean, NJ 07712** |
| **8-10-2017** | **15-CV-00346** | **(E.D. Wash.)** | **Desio v. Emerson Electric Co. d/b/a InSinErator**Plaintiff alleges that certain InSinkErator F-201 filters used in water filtration systems, which were designed to be used in instant hot water dispenser systems crack and cause water damage.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information call:****1 833 345-8375 (Ph.)** |
| **8-10-2017** | **12-CV-04677** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Ubiquiti Networks, Inc. Securities Litigation****Re Defendants: Robert J. Pera, John Ritchie, Peter Y. Chung, Christopher J. Crespi, Charles J. Fitzgerald, John L. Ocampo, and Robert M. Van Buskirk**Plaintiff alleges that in the Registration Statement and Prospectus, defendants made materially inaccurate and misleading statements and omissions about Ubiquiti’s business practices and financial results.They created the misleading impression that the sale of counterfeit Ubiquiti products was not a current problem by representing that Ubiquiti’s ability to sell its products at competitive prices and to be the sole provider of its products might not be adversely affected – and that its business, operating results and financial condition might not be materially and adversely affected – if the Company were unsuccessful in stopping counterfeit products by monitoring and enforcing its intellectual property rights in China. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, visit or e-mail:****LABATON SUCHAROW LLP****Jonathan Gardner****140 Broadway****New York, NY 10005****888 219-6877 (Ph.)**[**www.labaton.com**](http://www.labaton.com)**settlementquestions@labaton.com** |
| **8-10-2017** | **12-CV-04677** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Ubiquiti Networks, Inc. Securities Litigation****Re Defendants: UBS Securities LLC, Deustche Bank Securities Inc., Raymond James & Associates, Inc., and KeyBanc Capital Markets Inc. (formerly known as Pacific Crest Securities LLC) (collectively, the “Underwriter Defendants,” and with Ubiquiti and the Individual Defendants, the “Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that the Company’s Registration Statement contained materially false and misleading statements that counterfeiting of Ubiquiti’s wireless networking products was merely a risk faced by the Company. Plaintiffs allege that, instead, at the time of the IPO, an international counterfeiting ring was already operational and causing substantial harm to Ubiquiti’s financial results and damaging its goodwill and reputation. Plaintiffs allege that when disclosures were allegedly made about the impact of the counterfeiting, Ubiquiti’s stock price fell, and allegedly damaged class members. Also see above. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****LABATON SUCHAROW LLP****Jonathan Gardner****140 Broadway****New York, NY 10005****ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN &** **DOWD LLP****Daniel J. Pfefferbaum****Post Montgomery Center****One Montgomery Street Suite 1800****San Francisco, CA 94104** |
| **8-11-2017** | **16-CV-06981** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Tanya Mayhew, et al. v. KAS Direct, LLC and S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.**The lawsuit alleges that the Defendants violated certain laws in marketing and sales of Babyganics Products. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Melissa W. Wolchansky****Halunen Law****1650 IDS Center****80 So. 8th St.****Minneapolis, MN 55402** |
| **8-11-2017** | **17-CV-00869** | **(D. Or.)** | **Brown, et al. v. Price, et al.****Re Defendants: Norman Gary Price and Christina A. Price; Ronald J. Robertson and Katheryn Robertson; RP Capital, LLC; Timothy J. Feehan, Jr. and Kimberly A. Feehan; Strategic Capital Alternatives LLC; and SCA Holdings LLC**Plaintiffs purchased Aequitas Investments from investment adviser representatives at Strategic Capital Group (“SCG”) and Private Advisory Group (“PAG”). The Plaintiffs allege that they hired PAG or SCG and their representatives to provide objective investment advice. Plaintiffs allege that the defendants acted wrongfully in offering and selling the Aequitas investments by failing to adequately disclose the risks of the investments and failing to disclose the defendants’ relationship with Aequitas. Plaintiffs filed a lawsuit against control persons and investment advisor representatives of SCG and PAG, and RP Capital Group, which plaintiffs allege assisted in the Aequitas sales. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Robert S. Bank, Jr.****Samuels Yoelin Kantor, LLP****111 SW Fifth Avenue****Suite 3800****Portland, OR 97204****Lawrence R. Cock****Cable Langenbach Kinerk &**  **Bauer, LLP****Suite 3500****1000 Second Avenue Building****Seattle, WA 98104** |
| **8-11-2017** | **16-CV-02740** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Garbaccio v. Saint Joseph’s Hospital & Medical Center****Re Defendants: St. Joseph’s Hospital and Medical Center and Subsidiaries, St. Joseph’s Hospital and Medical Center d/b/a St. Joseph’s Regional Medical Center, St. Joseph’s Healthcare System, Inc., and St. Joseph’s Reginal Medical Center Pension Plan Committee**Plaintiffs allege that St. Joseph’s violated the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”). Specifically, the complaint alleges that St. Joseph’s denied the Plan’s participants and beneficiaries the protections of ERISA by claiming that the Plan qualified as an ERISA-EXEMPT “Church Plan.” The complaint also alleged that the Plan sponsored by St. Joseph’s - a non-profit Catholic healthcare provider - did not qualify as an ERISA-exempt Church Plan. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or fax:****Karen Handorf****Scott Lempert****Mary Borscheller****Cohen Milstein Sellers &** **Toll PLLC****1100 New York Ave, N.W.****Suite 500****Washington,DC 20005****202 408-4699 (Fax)** |
| **8-11-2017** | **08-CV-09361** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Indergit v. Rite Aid Corporation, and Rite Aid of New York, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that Rite Aid failed to pay salaried Store Managers for all hours worked over 40 in a work week as required by the federal Fair Labor Standards Act (the “FLSA”) and New York state law. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Robert John Valli, Jr.****Sara Wyn Kane****James A. Vagnini****Valli Kane & Vagnini, LLP****600 Old Country Road, Suite 519****Garden City, NY 11530** |
| **8-14-2017** | **11-MD-2262****11-CV-5450** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: LIBOR-Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Citigroup Inc. and Citibank, N.A.**Plaintiffs have alleged, among other things, that Citibank: (1) violated the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1, by conspiring to manipulate the U.S. Dollar LIBOR rate; (2) breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing by manipulating the U.S. Dollar LIBOR rate; and (3) was unjustly enriched as a result of its manipulative acts in connection withU.S. Dollar LIBOR. It is further alleged that Plaintiffs and the OTC Class suffered monetary damages as a result of Citibank’s (and the other Defendants’) alleged conduct. | **11-13-2017** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****William C. Carmody****Arun Subramanian****Seth Ard****SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.****1301 Avenue of the Americas****32nd Floor****New York, NY 10019****212 336-8334 (Ph.)****bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com****asubramanian@susmangodfrey.com****sard@susmangodfrey.com** |
| **8-14-2017** | **15-CV-01261** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Claridge v. North American Power & Gas, LLC** The lawsuit alleges that North American Power & Gas, LLC (“NAPG”) made misleading representations, contrary to its obligations under applicable laws. Plaintiffs also allege that NAPG’s rates were not, as it claimed in its consumer contracts, based on market related factors or prevailing market rates. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****D. Greg Blankinship** **Finkelstein, Blankinship,**  **Frei-Pearson & Garber LLP****445 Hamilton Avenue****Suite 605****White Plains, NY 10601** |
| **8-17-2017** | **10-CV-01993** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Rainbow Business Solutions, d/b/a Precision Tune Auto Care, et al. v. MBF Leasing LLC, et al.****Re Defendants: Northern Leasing Systems, Inc., MBF Leasing LLC, Northern Funding LLC, Jay Cohen, Lenoard Mezei, Sara Krieger, Sam Buono, and SKS Associates, LLC**Plaintiffs allege that during the period from 3-26-2006 to 2010, Leasing Defendants used an inflated cost basis to assess personal property taxes on leased equipment. In particular, Plaintiffs claim that Leasing Defendants did not use the actual “equipment cost” but rather an “acquisition cost” that improperly included commissions paid to sales agents, who induced class members to enter into the leases. Plaintiffs allege violations of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act and Fair Credit Reporting Act; fraud, deceit and/or misrepresentation; negligent misrepresentation; conversion; breach of contract; breach of the duty of good faith; false advertising under California Business and Professions Code sections 17500, *et seq.*; and unfair business practices under California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq*. | **11-28-2017** | **For more information write to:****Gutride Safier LLP****100 Pine Street****Suite 1250****San Francisco, CA 94111** **Claim Administrator at**  **Northern Leasing Settlement****c/o A.B. Data, Ltd.****P.O. Box 173043****Milwaukee, WI 53217** |
| **8-17-2017** | **11-CV-01320** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Ubaldi v. SLM Corporation****Re Defendants: Navient Solutions, LLC (“NSL”, Navient Corporation, and SLM PC Student Loan Trust 2004-A (“2004-A Trust”)**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants charged Class Members late fees that were in excess of the amount they were entitled to charge under the law. The Class Representatives assert claims against Defendants for violation of The Unfair Competition Law, California Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Andrew Friedman****Cohen Milstein Sellers** **& Toll, PLLC****1100 New York Avenue Suite 500****Washington, D.C. 20005** |
| **8-18-2017** | **16-CV-81911** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Matthew Gottlieb v. CITGO Petroleum Corporation**The lawsuit alleges that CITGO sent text messages to Plaintiff’s wireless telephone number without prior express written consent in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 (“TCPA”); and seeks actual and statutory damages under the TCPA on behalf of the named Plaintiff and a class of all individuals in the United States. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Jeff Ostrow****Kopelowitz Ostrow Ferguson****Weiselberg Gilbert****1 West Las Olas****Suite 500****Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301** |
| **8-18-2017** | **16-CV-08637** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **In re: Broiler Chicken Antitrust – Maplevale Farms, Inc. and John Gross and Company, Inc., et al v. Fieldale Farms Corporation, et al.**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants and their co-conspirators conspired to fix, raise, maintain, and stabilize the price of Broilers. The principal (but not exclusive) method by which Defendants implemented and executed their conspiracy was by coordinating their output and limited production with the intent and expected result of increasing prices of Broilers in the United States. In furtherance of their conspiracy, Defendants exchanged detailed, competitively sensitive, and closely-guarded non-public information about prices, capacity, sales volume, and demand, including through third party co-conspirator Agri Stats.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****W. Joseph Bruckner****Heidi M. Silton****Elizabeth R. Odette****Brain D. Clark****Lockridge Grindal Nauen** **P.L.L.P.****100 Washington Avenue South****Suite 2200****Menneapolis, MN 55401****612 339-6900 (Ph.)****612 339-0981 (Fax)****wjbruckner@locklaw.com****hmsilton@locklaw.com****bdclark@locklaw.com** |
| **8-20-2017** | **16-CV-785** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **Burk v. Seterus, Inc.**Plaintiff asserts class-wide claims for monetary damages under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (“FCRA”), 15 U.S.C. § 1681b and injunctive relief. The Action contends that Seterus (“Defendant”) lacked a permissible purpose to obtain consumers’ FICO credit scores from Experian on or after 9-22-2011 after (i) the consumer’s loan was discharged in Chapter 7 or Chapter 13 bankruptcy; (ii) the consumer’s loan was closed with a zero balance; (iii) the servicing of the consumer’s loan had been sold or transferred to a third party; or (iv) the real property securing the consumer’s home loan had been foreclosed or sold through a short sale or deed in lieu of foreclosure. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call or e-mail:****Kristi Kelly****703 424-7572 (Ph.)****kkelly@kellyandcrandall.com** |
| **8-20-2017** | **17-CV-2264** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Logan Landes, et al. v. Sony Mobile Communications (U.S.A.), Inc. and Sony Electronics, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that Sony designed, manufactured, distributed, advertised and sold certain Mobile Devices that were alleged to be “waterproof,” but are, in fact, “not waterproof and are not designed for or capable of ordinary underwater use.” Plaintiffs further allege that “Sony exploited certain international water resistance ratings in order to launch a deceptive marketing campaign promoting the Devices.” | **12-1-2017** | **For more information write, call, fax or visit:****Nancy A. Kulesa****Shannon L. Hopkins****Levi & Korsinsky LLP****30 Broad Street****24th Floor****New York, NY 10004****212 363-7500 (Ph.)****212 363-7171 (Fax)**[**www.zlk.com**](http://www.zlk.com) |
| **8-21-2017** | **16-CV-04742** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **Donoghue v. Tesinc LLC**Plaintiff alleges that the Defendants violated the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (“FLSA”), the Pennsylvania Minimum Wage Act (“PMWA”), the Pennsylvania Wage Payment and Collection Law (“PWPCL”), and the New Jersey Wage and Hour Law (“NJWHL”) by misclassifying them and other workers as independent contractors and failing to pay them overtime wages. | **11-21-2017** | **For more information write or e-mail:****James B. Zouras****David J. Cohen****Stephan Zouras****604 Spruce Street** **Philadelphia, PA 19106****jzouras@stephanzouras.com****dcohen@stephanzouras.com**  |
| **8-21-2017** | **15-CV-06942** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Vergara, et al. v. Uber Technologies, Inc.** Plaintiffs allege that Uber engaged in violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., by sending automated text messages without consent to the Plaintiffs and entities in the Settlement Classes. | **1-23-2018** | **For more information write, e-mail or call:****Hassan A. Zavareei****Andrea R. Gold****TYCKO & ZAVAREEI LLP****1828 L Street, N.W.** **Suite 1000****Washington, DC 20036****hzavareei@tzlegal.com****agold@tzlegal.com****202-973-0900 (Ph.)** |
| **8-21-2017** | **12-CV-2661** | **(D. Ariz.)** | **Michael Reid, et al. v. I.C. System, Inc.**Plaintiff claimed, among other things, that Defendant placed calls to cellular telephones contrary to federal law. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Abbas Kazerounian****Kazerouni Law Group, APC****245 Fischer Avenue****Unit D-1****Costa Mesa, CA 92626-4539** |
| **8-21-2017** | **16-CV-05464** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Suarez, et al. v. Rosa Mexicano Brands Inc., et al.**The Lawsuit alleges that Rosa Mexicano (“Defendant”) violated federal and state labor laws by failing to provide Class Members with the proper minimum wage and overtime pay for all hours worked, as well as distributing tips to allegedly tip ineligible employees. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Fitapelli & Schaffer, LLP****28 Liberty Street****30th Floor****New York, NY 10005** |
| **8-22-2017** | **15-CV-01596** | **(W.D. Pa.)** | **Hartman v. Medicredit, Inc.**Fairness Hearing set, for more information see page 4 above. | **11-27-2017** | **For more information see page 4 above.** |
| **8-24-2017** | **14-CV-02793** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Richard Burns, et al. v. Lawrence W. Maxwell, et al.**Plaintiffs allege that certain covenants in the recorded Master Declarations of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions that encumbered the Lots in the Lake Ashton Communities, and which imposed a perpetual obligation upon the owners of those Lots to pay for certain cable television and security services to an entity known as MX Communications Services, LLC (“the MX System Assessment”), were prohibited by Florida state laws governing homeowner’s associations, that the Developer and Developer’s attorneys violated certain federal and/or state laws (including anti-racketeering and trade practices laws) and/or FCC regulations in creating the MX System Assessment and by enforcing or attemptingto enforce the MX System Assessment, and that the Developer misrepresented the MX SystemAssessment in connection with the sales of Lots. | **10-5-2017** | **For more information write to:****Daniel W. Perry****4767 New Broad Street #1007****Orlando, FL 32814** |
| **8-25-2017** | **14-CV-81057** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **In re: Ocwen Financial Corporation Securities Litigation**Plaintiff filed its Consolidated Class Action Complaint asserting claims that Defendants issued misrepresentations and omissions during the Class Period (i.e., 5-2-2013 through 12-19- 2014, inclusive) regarding Ocwen’s compliance with regulations imposed upon Ocwen by regulators, including the New York Department of Financial Services and the National Mortgage Settlement, and in connection with Ocwen’s policies, practices and procedures over its transactions with other entities chaired by Defendant William C. Erbey (“Erbey”).  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Kessler Topaz Meltzer &**  **Check, LLP****Sharan Nirmul****Richard A. Russo, Jr.****280 King of Prussia Road****Radnor, PA 19087** |
| **8-25-2017** | **13-CV-1330** | **(W.D. Mich.)** | **Pryor v. Law Offices of Timothy E. Baxter & Associates, PC, et al.****Re Defendants: PC, Midland Funding LLC, Midland Credit Management, Inc. and Encore Capital Group, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that Defendant Law Offices of Timothy E. Baxter & Associates, P.C. attempted to collect the judgments on behalf of its clients, including Defendant Midland Funding, LLC. Midland Credit Management, Inc. and Encore Capital Group, Inc. were also named as Defendants. Plaintiffs contend that in initiating post judgment garnishments, Defendants violated federal and state law by including in the statement of amount due on the judgments the cost of garnishments that were not recoverable under MCR 3.101(R) (2). Plaintiffs assert that such conduct renders Defendants liable for statutory damages under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, analogous state law, and actual damages for sums collected or assessed for costs that were not recoverable under MCR 3.101(R)(2).   | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Kevin Jame Rogers****Law Office of**  **Phillip C. Rogers****6140 28th Street., SE****Suite 115****Grand Rapids, MI 49546****616 776-1176 (Ph.)****Michael O. Nelson****1104 Fuller Ave. NE****Grand Rapids, MI 49503****616 559-2665 (Ph.)** |
| **8-25-2018** | **16-CV-3711** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: SSA Bonds Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Bank of America Corporation, Bank of America N.A., Bank of America Merrill Lynch International Limited, Merrill Lynch International, and Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Incorporation (collectively “BofA”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants conspired to manipulate the market for U.S. dollar- denominated supranational, sovereign, and agency (“SSA”) bonds. Rather than the DealerDefendants competing with each other for the purchase and sale of SSA bonds to investors and to each other, the Dealer Defendants worked as one team. Each openly shared with others their own bank’s competitively sensitive pricing information, their customers’ trading histories and requests for quotes, their positions and trading strategies, and inside information about the pricing and demand for new issues of SSA bonds. In effect, the Dealer Defendants secretly functioned as a unitary “super-desk” that enabled them to exert influence over the SSA bond market that would be impossible if they had been acting independently. By undermining competition across the SSA market through this illegal scheme, Defendants reaped bountiful profits for nearly a decade at the expense of Plaintiffs and other investors. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Samuel H. Rudman****58 South Service Road Suite 200****Melville, NY 11747****631 367-7100 (PH.)****631 367-1173 (Fax)****SRudman@rgrdlaw.com****David W. Mitchell****Brian O. O’Mara****Carmen A. Medici****655 West Broadway****Suite 1900****San Diego, CA 92101****619 231-1058 (Ph.)****619 231-7423 (Fax)****davidm@rgrdlaw.com****bomara@rgrdlaw.com****cmedici@rgrdlaw.com** |
| **8-25-2017** | **12-MD-02311****12-MD-00503** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation In re: Automotive Bearings****Re Defendants: Nachi-Fujikoshi Corporation and Nachi America Inc.** Plaintiffs allege that Defendants’ conspiracy successfully targeted the long-struggling United States automotive industry, raising prices for car manufacturers and purchasers alike. Plaintiffs also bring this action under Rule 23(a) and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure seeking damages pursuant to the antitrust, unfair competition, consumer protection, and unjust enrichment laws of the states. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Cotchett, Pitre, & McCarthy**  **LLP****San Francisco Airport** **Office Center****840 Malcolm Road****Suite 200****Burlingame, CA 94010****Robins Kaplan LLP****399 Park Avenue****Suite 3600****New York, NY 10022** |
| **8-27-2017** | **14-CV-05853** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Craft, et al. v. Health Care Service Corporation**Plaintiffs claimed that Health Care Services Corporation’s (HCSC’s) enforcement of Residential Treatment Center (RTC) Exclusions violated federal law and its duties to plan beneficiaries and family member. In particular, Plaintiffs claim that by enforcing an exclusion of residential treatment of mental health conditions, while not enforcing any exclusion of residential treatment of physical conditions (such as treatment of medical conditions in a skilled nursing or inpatient rehabilitation facility), HCSC violated the Paul Wellstone and Pete Domenici Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act of 2008 (the “Parity Act”), its implementing regulations, and the Employment Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”). | **Not set yet** | **For more information call:****1 888 755-9508 (Ph.)** |
| **8-29-2017** | **12-CV-00101****12-CV-00102****12-CV-00402** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Wire Harness Direct Purchaser****In re: Heater Control Panels Automobile Dealer****Re Defendants: Sumitomo Electric Industries, Ltd., Sumitomo Wiring Systems, Ltd., Sumitomo Electric Wiring Systems, Inc. (incorporating K&S Wiring Systems, Inc) and Sumitomo Wiring Systems (U.S.A.) Inc.**On 8-18-2017, the court entered a Final Judgement Approving Settlement Agreement Between Automobile Dealer Plaintiffs and Sumitomo and Entering Dismissal With Prejudice as to Sumitomo. On 8-25-2017, the court further entered an Order and Final Judgment as to the Direct Purchaser settlement.  | **8-25-2017** | **No Information:** |
| **8-30-2017** | **14-CV-01374** | **(S.D.W. Va.)** | **Crystal Good, et al. v. West Virginia-American Water Company, et al.****Re Defendants: American Water Works Company, Inc., American Water Works Service Company, Inc. and West Virginia-American Water Company** On 1-9-2014, a chemical leak into the Elk River at the Freedom Industries tank farm near Charleston caused over two hundred thousand residential and business water users served by West Virginia-American Water Company (“West Virginia American”) to be without tap water other than for toilet flushing and fire protection. Freedom Industries purchased the chemical, Crude MCHM, from Eastman. The class action lawsuit claims that American Water and Eastman could have prevented or avoided the event with better precautionary measures, compliance with applicable regulations and the use of reasonable care. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call or visit:****1 855 829-8121 (Ph.)**[**www.wvwaterclaims.com**](http://www.wvwaterclaims.com) |
| **8-31-2017** | **16-CV-0182** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Belinda Gutierrez-Rodriguez v. R.M. Galicia dba Progressive Management Systems**Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) by calling persons on their cellular phones using an automatic telephone dialing system or artificial or prerecorded voice, without prior express consent. The TCPA provides, among other relief, that a plaintiff may seek statutory damages of up to $500 per violation, and that this amount may be trebled for willful violations. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:****Ronald A. Marron****Alexis M. Wood****Kas L. Gallucci****The Law Offices of** **Ronald A. Marron****651 Arroyo Drive****San Diego, California 92108****Admin@ConsumersAdvocates.com** |
| **8-31-2017** | **16-CV-00278** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Boswell, et al. v. Costco Wholesale Corporation****A final approval hearing has been set.** | **12-4-2017** | **For more information visit:**[**www.KirklandCoconutOilSettlement.com**](http://www.KirklandCoconutOilSettlement.com)**.** |
| **8-31-2017** | **14-CV-02011** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Callaway v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC**Plaintiff alleges the seat heaters in the Subject Vehicles may overheat causing a hot spot to develop that can potentially spark, smoke or burn a hole through the seat cover. The operative complaint asserts fraud-based claims, including claims for fraudulent concealment, violation of California’s Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civil Code § 1781 et seq., and violation of California’s Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****FRANK SIMS & STOLPER LLP****Jason M. Frank****Scott H. Sims****19800 MacArthur Blvd.****Suite 855****Irvine, California 92612****949 201-2400 (Ph.)****949 201-2405 (Fax)** |
| **8-31-2017** | **15-CV-00793** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **JWD Automotive, Inc. d/b/a NAPA Auto Care of Cape Coral v. DJM Advisory Group, LLC, Banner Life Insurance Company, and William Penn Life Insurance Company of New York**Plaintiff JWD Automotive, Inc. (“JWD Automotive”) filed this class action lawsuit against DJM Advisory Group LLC, Banner Life Insurance Company and William Penn Life Insurance Company of New York (“Defendants”) alleging that they violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act. | **12-4-2017** | **For more information write to:****Ryan M. Kelly****Anderson + Wanca****3701 Algonquin Road** **Suite 500****Rolling Meadows, IL 60008** |