

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in August, 2012 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
8-3-2012	08-CV-1697	(S.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Lifschitz v. NextWave Wireless, Inc.</b>            Plaintiffs allege that NextWave and certain officers violated the Securities Exchange Act by issuing materially false and misleading statements regarding the Company's business and financial results throughout the class period. Specifically, the complaints alleged that defendants misrepresented and failed to disclose that: (1) NextWave did not have adequate liquidity to continue operating as it executed its growth strategy and continued making aggressive worldwide acquisitions; (2) NextWave did not have the wherewithal to launch its new WiMax semiconductor products in the first six months of 2008; (3) NextWave did not have the financial resources to continue as a going concern; (4) NextWave did not have the financial resources to continue to operate its world-wide operations through the end of 2008; and (5) defendants had no reasonable basis to make favorable statements that the company's WiMax semiconductor products would be available for commercial sale in the first half of 2008.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased shares of NextWave common stock between 11-14-2006 and 8-7-2008, inclusive (the "Class Period").</p>	11-9-2012	<p>For more information visit, write or call:</p> <p><a href="http://www.nextwavelitigationsettlement.com">www.nextwavelitigationsettlement.com</a></p> <p>Deborah R. Gross            Law Office            Bernard M. Gross, P,C,            100 Penn Square East            Suite 450            Philadelphia, Pa. 19107</p> <p>(215) 561-3600</p>
8-6-2012	11-CV-00894	(N.D. Ohio)	<p><b>K. Roche, D.C., d/b/a Back Doctors, Ltd. v. Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company</b>            Plaintiffs allege that Nationwide improperly reduced or denied insurance benefits for medical</p>	Not set yet	No information

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in August, 2012 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>or rehabilitative services after submitting medical bills to a medical review vendor. Specifically, the Lawsuit challenges payment reductions of those services based upon a reasonableness or usual and customary charge review by Mitchell Medical.</p> <p>Class Members includes all persons who were covered under Medical Expense Coverage issued by a Nationwide Insurance affiliated company, received medical services for a covered person, and if medical charges submitted after 11-8-2007 were paid by Nationwide in an amount less than the full amount charged.</p>		
8-7-2012	08-CV-0342 10-CV-01025	(E.D. Ark.)	<p><b>Helmert v. Butterball, LLC</b> <b>Garner v. Butterball, LLC</b></p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated federal and Arkansas law in that Butterball employees were not paid all wages to which they were entitled. The Butterball employees claimed they work off-the-clock, both pre-and post-shift and during meal breaks. The Lawsuits have asked for damages from Butterball for the alleged unpaid overtime wages, liquidated damages and other applicable penalties, and attorneys' fees and expenses.</p> <p>Class Members are all current or former hourly-paid "production employees" (defined as Evisceration, Bagging/Packaging, Deboning, Boxing, Boneless Rolled Turkey (BRT), Smoke &amp; Bake, Tied Toast and Traypack) who work or worked at the Butterball, LLC turkey processing plants</p>		<p>For more information visit, call or write:</p> <p><a href="mailto:mreimnitz@larsonking.com">mreimnitz@larsonking.com</a></p> <p>1-877-373-5501</p> <p>Monica Reimnitz Larson - King, LLP 30 East Seventh St Suite 2800 St. Paul, MN 55101</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in August, 2012 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			locating in Huntsville and Ozark, Arkansas, at any time between 10-2-2006 and 7-1-2012. This includes any employees who were placed by temporary agencies to work in these plants.		
8-9-2012	09-CV-1110	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p><b>In re: Public Employees' Retirement System of Mississippi v. The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc., et al.</b></p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act by making untrue statements of material fact, or by omitting material facts necessary to make statements not misleading, in offering documents for the certificates, regarding: (1) the underwriting standards purportedly used in connection with the origination of the underlying mortgages; (2) the maximum loan-to-value ratios used to qualify borrowers; (3) the appraisals of the properties underlying the mortgages; (4) the debt-to income ratios permitted on the loans; and (5) the ratings of the certificates.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased or otherwise acquired publicly offered certificates of GSAMP Trust 2006-S2 during the Class Period, and were damaged thereby.</p>	11-8-2012	<p>For more information call or visit:</p> <p>888-260-2722</p> <p><a href="http://www.GoldmanSachsRMBSLitigation.com">www.GoldmanSachsRMBSLitigation.com</a></p>
8-9-2012	07-CV-2249	(D.N.J.)	<p><b>John Dewey, Jacqueline Delguercio, et al. v. Volkswagen of America, Inc., et al.</b></p> <p>Plaintiffs allege, among other claims, breaches of express and implied warranty, and that the Settlement Class Vehicles were unduly susceptible to water ingress into the passenger compartment</p>	Not set yet	No information

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in August, 2012 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>through sunroof drains and/or the fresh air plenum, that the Class Vehicles were damaged or were at risk of sustaining damages, and that the Defendants failed to provide appropriate maintenance instructions to prevent or mitigate the effects of the alleged defects and pay for damages sustained.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who are now or have been at any time owners of record or lessees of model year 1997-2006 Audi A4 (B5 ad B6 Platforms) (VINs in MY 2005 with "8E" in position 7 and 8 with also "J" or "L" or "V" or "P" or "X" in position 4, VINs in MY 2005 and 2006 with "8H" in position 7 and 8) (including Cabrio, S and RS versions) and model year 1998-2005 Audi A6 Settlement Class Vehicles (C5 Platform) (VINs with "4B" in position 7 and 8) (including Allroad, S and RS versions) distributed for sale or lease in the United States by Audi America.</p>		
8-10-2012	09-CV-06220	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p><b>In re Tronox, Inc. Securities Litigation</b> Plaintiffs allege violations of Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder based on allegedly false and misleading statements issued by Tronox and certain of its officers and directors from 11-21-2005 through 1-12-2009.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities who purchased or otherwise acquired shares of Tronox Class A and/or Class B common stock ("Tronox Common Stock") and/or Tronox 9½% senior notes due 2012 ("Tronox Bonds") from 12-21-2005 through and</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write or call:</p> <p>Solmon B. Cera Thomas C. Bright Gold Bennett Cera &amp; Sidener LLP 59 Market Street San Francisco, CA 10019 1-800-778-1822</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in August, 2012 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			including 1-12-2009 and who were damaged thereby.		
8-13-2012	11-MD-02261	(S.D. Cal.)	<p><b>In re: Jiffy Lube International, Inc.</b> Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act and similar state laws by sending text messages without the consent of consumers to receive text message ads.</p> <p>Class Members are all Persons residing in the United States and its Territories who were sent the text message ad in April 2011.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write or call:</p> <p>Jay Edelson Edelson McGire, LLC 350 North LaSalle Street Suite 1300 Chicago, IL. 60654  1-866-354-3015</p>
8-15-2012	11-CV-10001	(D. Mass.)	<p><b>Carey, et al. v. New Balance Athletic Shoe, Inc.</b> Plaintiffs allege that New Balance, in connection with the marketing and sale of Toning Shoes, misrepresented the benefits of wearing Toning Shoes to consumers. Plaintiffs claim that Toning Shoes did not provide the benefits to consumers claimed by New Balance.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities that bought Toning Shoes from New Balance U.S. Retailers, New Balance Stores, shopnewbalance.com, joesnewbalanceoutlet.com, New Balance Outlets, or other third-party retailers from 1-1-2010 through (not set yet).</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information call:</p> <p>1-866-893-0232</p>
8-15-2012	10-MDL-2179	(E.D. La.)	<p><b>In re: Oil Spill by the Oil Rig "Deepwater Horizon"</b> Plaintiffs allege that certain economic loss and property damage claims have arisen from the</p>	Not set yet	No information

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in August, 2012 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>"Deepwater Horizon Incident" in the Gulf of Mexico beginning on 4-20-2010. Plaintiffs seek money and other relief for economic and property damage alleged to have been caused by the Deepwater Horizon Incident.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who had economic loss or property damage because of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.</p>		
8-16-2012	08-CV-05701	(N.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Marolda v. Symantec Corp.</b> Plaintiffs allege that when customers had previously enrolled in Norton's automatic renewal program and then subsequently upgraded their Norton software, Symantec improperly charged them for both the upgrade and the earlier subscription.</p> <p>Class Members includes all individuals, businesses and other entities in the United States who between 10-1-2005 and 5-23-2012: (a) purchased an Eligible Product; (b) enrolled in Norton's automatic renewal service for that Product; (c) purchased/renewed a second Eligible Product either during the term of a subscription to the first Eligible Product or within 60 days after being charged an automatic renewal charge for that first Eligible Product; (d) installed the second Eligible Product on the same computer as the first Eligible Product; and (e) have not received a refund of the automatic renewal charge.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit or call: <a href="http://www.NortonSettlement.com">www.NortonSettlement.com</a> 1-877-853-3045</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in August, 2012 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
8-16-2012	10-CV-01089	(N.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Tijero v. Aaron Brothers, Inc.</b> Plaintiffs allege that Defendant violated the Fair Labor Standards Act, the California Labor Code, other applicable California wage and hour orders and laws, and the California Unfair Competition Law. Specifically, Plaintiffs assert causes of action for: (1) unpaid wages under the Labor Code; (2) unpaid overtime wages under the Fair Labor Standards Act; (3) unpaid overtime under the Labor Code; (4) failure to provide meal breaks; (5) failure to provide rest breaks; (6) failure to pay minimum wages for "off the clock" work; (7) failure to pay all compensation due at termination based on being paid final wages with a pay card; (8) failure to provide accurate wage statements; (9) violation of California's Unfair Competition Law; and (10) penalties under California's Private Attorney General Act.</p> <p>Class Members are persons who were employed by Aaron Brothers as a non-exempt, hourly employee in California between 5-7-2005 and [the date of the entry of the Court's Order Granting Preliminary Approval].</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:</p> <p>Kristopher P. Badame Badame &amp; Associates, APC 25432 Trabuco Road Suite 207 Lake Forest, CA 92630</p> <p>213-229-7000</p> <p>213-229-7520</p> <p><a href="mailto:cconway@gibsondunn.com">cconway@gibsondunn.com</a></p> <p><a href="mailto:jcripps@gibsondunn.com">jcripps@gibsondunn.com</a></p>
8-17-2012	11-CV-00252	(C.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Hugo Gonzalez, et al. v. Dynacast, Inc.</b> Plaintiff Hugo Gonzalez alleged that Dynacast, Inc. violated California labor law by: failing to provide lawful duty free rest periods and meal periods, or pay compensation in lieu thereof; failing to pay wages (including overtime and minimum wages); failing to pay all wages due at</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Thomas S. Campbell Rastegar &amp; Matern, Attorneys at Law 1010 Crenshaw Boulevard Suite 100 Torrance, Cal. 90501</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in August, 2012 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>termination; failing to reimburse business expenses; taking unlawful deductions; failing to pay premiums for split shifts; failing to pay reported time wages; and failing to provide accurate itemized employee wage statements. Gonzales further alleged that Dynacast violated California's Unfair Competition Law set forth in California Business &amp; Professions Code and sought civil penalties under the Private Attorney General's Act.</p> <p>Class Members are all current and former non-exempt employees employed by Defendant in the state of California, between 10-27-2006 and [date of preliminary approval], but excluding any person who previously settled or released the claims covered by this settlement, or any person who previously was paid or received awards through civil or administrative actions for the claims covered by this settlement.</p>		
8-17-2012	11-CV-53155 11-CV-53156	(Bankr.D. Del.)	<p><b>Kohlstadt v. Solyndra, LLC and 360 Degree Solar Holdings, Inc., Adversary Proceeding and Braun v. Solyndra, LLC and 360 Degree Solar Holdings, Inc., Adversary Proceeding</b></p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that the Debtors violated the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (the "WARN Act") by ordering plant closing and/or mass layoffs on or about 8-31-2011 and thereafter, without providing sixty (60) days advance notice thereof. The Plaintiffs further allege that, as a consequence of this alleged failure, the Class Members have a priority claim pursuant to 507(a) (4)-(5) of the Bankruptcy Code</p>	Not set yet	<p><b>For more information write to:</b></p> <p>The Gardner Firm, P.C. 210 S. Washington Avenue Post Officer Drawer 3103 Mobile, AL 36652 Attn: Mary E. Olsen</p>



**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in August, 2012 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>against the Debtors for damages for the alleged sixty (60) day violation period.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who: (i) were employed by Solyndra, LLC ("Solyndra") and 360 Degree Solar Holdings, Inc. in the United States, including those employed at facilities located at 47700, 47488 and 1055 Kato Road, 901 Page Avenue, Fremont, Cal., 94538 and 1201 California Circle, Milpitas, Cal., 95035 (each an "Affected Facility" collectively, the "Affected Facilities"); (ii) suffered an "employment loss", on, or within thirty (30) days of, 8-31-2011, as part of a "plant closing" or "mass layoff," at the affected facilities.</p>		
8-24-2012	09-CV-01298	(C.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Christopher Kearney, et al. vs. Hyundai Motor America</b></p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that certain vehicles involved in this lawsuit suffered from a defect in the Occupant Classification System, which is part of the advanced air bag system of certain Hyundai vehicles. The lawsuit claimed that the OCS would not consistently recognize certain small-statured adults as adults, causing the passenger-side air bag to be deactivated (i.e., unavailable to deploy in the event of an accident) when such persons occupied the front passenger seat.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who: (i) reside in the District of Columbia or one of the fifty (50) states of the United States and (ii) are current owners of one of the "Class Vehicles" as follows: 1) Model year 2006-2008 Hyundai Sonata vehicles;</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write:</p> <p><b>Robert B. Carey Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP 11 W. Jefferson St. Suite 1000 Phoenix, AZ 85003</b></p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in August, 2012 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			2) Model year 2007-2009 Hyundai Santa Fe vehicles produced from 4-19-2006 to 7-7-2008 and 3) Model year 2006-2009 Hyundai Azera Vehicles.		
8-24-2012	11-CV-00220	(C.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Jo Armuth, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated. v. John Linton, et al.</b>  Plaintiff alleged that the products sold were not authorized AminoGenesis-brand products, but were in fact, "Knock-Off" products. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants' conduct in this regard violated: (1) §17500 et seq. of the California Business &amp; Professions Code; (2) §17200 of the California Business &amp; Professional Code; and (3) §1750 of the California Civil Code also known as the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act. Plaintiff's complaint seeks injunctive relief and actual damages, injunctive relief and restitution for unfair business practices, restitution and injunctive relief for false advertising, an award of costs and attorneys' fees, and such other relief the Court deems proper.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons/entities whose rights were affected if, between 1-1-2009 and 7-31-2010, a purchase was made of an AminoGenesis Product from Pinnacle, AG Skincare, or Ventures, unless the product was previously returned and a refund was received.</p>	8-27-2012	<p>For more information visit or write or call:</p> <p><a href="http://www.AGSkinCareSettlement.com">www.AGSkinCareSettlement.com</a></p> <p>Douglas L. Johnson  Johnson &amp; Johnson LLP  439 Canon Drive  Suite 200  Los Angeles, CA 90210</p> <p>310-975-1080</p>