| **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name**  **Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **Website Link** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2-2-2015** | **07-CV-02784** | **(W.D. Tenn.)** | **In re: Regions Morgan Keegan Open-End Mutual Fund Litigation**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs filed the Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint (“CAC”) alleging seven causes of action based on federal law (§§ 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933; §§ 10(b) and 20 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; and various sections of the Investment Company Act of 1940) on behalf of the investors in the Funds. On 9-30-2010, the Court entered an order granting in part and denying in part Defendants’ motion to dismiss the CAC. There are two Class Periods: all persons who 1) purchased shares of one or more of the funds during the period 12-6-2004 through 12-6-2007, inclusive or 2) held and/or redeemed shares of one or more of the funds during the period 7-3-2006 to 5-29-2009. | **Not set yet** | Prepared by Brenda Berkley  **For more information write, fax or e-mail:**  **Richard A. Lockridge**  **Vernon J. Vander Weide**  **Gregg M. Fishbein**  **Lockridge Grindal Nauen**  **P.L.L.P.**  **100 Washington Avenue**  **South**  **Suite 220**  **Minneapolis, MN 55401**  **612 339-0981**  [**ralockridge@locklaw.com**](mailto:ralockridge@locklaw.com) |
| **2-2-2015** | **11-CV-04321** | **(W.D. Mo.)** | **Barfield, et al. v. Sho-Me-Power Electric Cooperative, et al.**  Landowner-plaintiffs claim that two electric cooperatives exceeded the scope of easements granted for electric-transmission lines. The issue in this lawsuit is whether the Defendants needed to obtain new easements (besides the written electric easements they already had) from landowners to permit the Defendants to use the fiber-optic cables for commercial telecommunications. The Plaintiffs asked the Court to rule that the Defendants do not have the right to use the land for commercial telecommunications without paying for new easements. Plaintiffs do not challenge Defendants’ right to install, use, or maintain the fiber-optic cables for electric purposes. The Plaintiffs are not seeking to have the Defendants’ fiber-optic cables removed from Class Members’ land. The Plaintiffs have also asked for an award of money damages to eligible Missouri landowners for the commercial telecommunications use. The Class Period covers all who own or co-own (or formerly owned or co-owned) covered land on or after 11-29-2006 in the following Missouri counties: Barry, Barton, Bates, Benton, Camden, Cass, Cedar, Christian, Dade, Dallas, Greene, Henry, Hickory, Jasper, Lawrence, McDonald, Newton, Polk, St. Clair, Stone, Taney, or Vernon. The covered land includes land burdened by a KAMO written electric-transmission easement on which KAMO installed fiber optic cable and used it for commercial communication purposes. | **1-23-2015** | **For more information call or view:**  **1 888 959-0460 (Ph.)**  [**www.missourifibersettlement.com**](http://www.missourifibersettlement.com) |
| **2-2-2015** | **14-CV-00740** | **(N.D. Tex.)** | **Phillips v. Texas Industries, Inc., et al.**  Shareholder-plaintiff alleges that Martin Marietta announced an agreement and plan of merger pursuant to which Martin Marietta would acquire Texas Industries (“TXI”) by way of a merger in which holders of TXI common stock would receive 0.700 Martin Marietta shares for each share of TXI common stock. Plaintiff also alleges that the director Defendants breached their fiduciary duties to TXI’s stockholders in connection with the Transaction and that TXI and Martin Marietta aided and abetted those breaches, and seeks, among other things, an order enjoining the Transaction. The Class Period is from 3-25-2013 to 7-1-2014. | **6-10-2015** | **For more information write or call:**  **Juan E. Monteverde**  **Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP**  **369 Lexington Avenue**  **10th Floor**  **New York, NY 10017**  **212 983-9330 (Ph.)** |
| **2-3-2015** | **13-CV-03791** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: ECOtality, Inc. Securities Litigation**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that, before filing for bankruptcy, ECOtality designed, manufactured, tested and sold electric vehicle (“EV”) charging and energy storage systems know as Blink chargers and derived most of its revenues from the Department of Energy (“DOE”) for its participation in the DOE’s Vehicle Technologies Program. In 2009, ECOtality was awarded a grant of $100.2 million to, among other things, deploy Blink chargers and analyze EV charger usage data (“EV Project”). The Complaint claimed that the EV Project was modified in 2012 such that ECOtality was scheduled to deploy 13,200 EV chargers by 9-2013 and to complete data collection and analysis by 12-31-2013. Lead Plaintiff alleged in the Complaint that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements about the Company by purportedly falsely representing ECOtality would successfully complete the EV Project and meet the installation and data collection milestones when, in fact, the DOE allegedly had concluded ECOtality would not. Lead Plaintiff also alleged that Defendants purportedly falsely represented the Company would begin deliveries of the Minit-Charger 12, an industrial EV charger, by 3Q13 when they allegedly knew of numerous problems with the development of the Minit-Charger 12 that would prevent any sales in 2013, and that Defendants purportedly falsely represented ECOtality was successfully transitioning the Company to selling its products and services without government subsidies when they allegedly knew unsubsidized sales were substantially less than necessary to support ECOtality’s operations. The Class Period is from 4-16-2013 to 8-12-2013. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Rick Nelson**  **Shareholder Relations**  **Robins Geller Rudman &**  **Dowd LLP**  **655 West Broadway**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **2-4-2015** | **10-CV-01780**  **10-CV-01898**  **13-CV-2034** | **(D.D.C.)** | **Levine, et al. v. American Psychological Association and American Psychological Association Practice Organization**  **Engum v. American Psychological Association and American Psychological Association Practice Organization**  **Grossman v. American Psychological Association and American Psychological Association Practice Organization**  Member-plaintiffs allege that American Psychological Association (“APA”) and American Psychological Association Practice Organization (“APAPO”) engaged in unfair and deceptive practices by representing on annual dues statements and their website that payment of an annual “practice assessment” (or “special assessment”) was required for membership in APA, even though payment of the practice assessment was only required for membership in APAPO (the “APAPO Practice Assessment”). Each case was pleaded as a class action and sought monetary damages, restitution, attorneys’ fees, punitive damages, and injunctive relief. Class Members are all who are current or former members of APA and paid the APAPO Practice Assessment for APA dues years 2001 to [Preliminary Approval Date]. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call or visit:**  **1 888 593-4270 (Ph.)**  [**www.PracticeAssessmentSettlement.com**](http://www.PracticeAssessmentSettlement.com) |
| **2-5-2015** | **12-MN-00001** | **(D.S.C.)** | **In re: MI Windows and Doors, LLC**  Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that tape glazed windows manufactured by MI Window (MIWD) between 7-1-2000 and 3-31-2010 contain defects that have caused water intrusion (leaking) and resulting damage to Windows and Plaintiffs’ property; that some Window owners or former owners have paid for repairs or replacements of their Windows; and that some owners will require future repairs of their Windows. The Action asserts claims against MIWD for negligence, negligent misrepresentation, breach of contract, breach of express warranty, products liability, and breach of implied warranty of merchantability. The Class Period is from 7-1-2000 to 3-31-2010. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Class Counsel-Homeowners**  **Justin Lucey**  **415 Mill Street**  **P.O. Box 805**  **Mount Pleasant, SC 29465**  **Class Counsel for**  **Contractors**  **H. Blair Hahn**  **Richard, Patrick, Westbook & Brickman, LLC**  **1037 Chuck Dawley Blvd.**  **Building A**  **Mount Pleasant, SC 29464** |
| **2-5-2015** | **11-CV-7866** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: MF Global Holdings Ltd. Securities Litigation**  Securities-investor-plaintiffs assert claims under §§ 11 and 12 of the Securities Act of 1933 (the “Securities Act”) against the Settling Underwriter Defendants, the Non-Settling Underwriter Defendants, and the Individual  Defendants alleging that these Defendants were statutorily liable for false and misleading  statements in the offering materials for MF Global secondary offering of common stock and for the other MF Global Securities, as well as claims under § 15 of the Securities Act and §§ 10(b)and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder against some or all of the Individual Defendants. The Class Period is from 5-20-2010 to 11-21-2011. | **6-26-2015** | **For more information write to:**  **Bernstein Litowitz**  **Berger & Grossmann LLP**  **Savatore J. Graziano**  **1285 Ave. of the Americas**  **New York, NY 10019**  **Bleichmar Fonti Tountas &**  **Auld LLP**  **Javier Bleichmar**  **7 Times Square**  **27th Floor**  **New York, NY 10036** |
| **2-6-2015** | **12-MD-02328** | **(E.D. La.)** | **In re: Pool Products Distribution Market Antitrust Litigation**  Direct-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that PoolCorp and the Manufacturer Defendants entered into agreements to protect and enhance PoolCorp’s market share, margins and prices and that PoolCorp attempted to monopolize the market for Pool Products in the U.S. in violation of the antitrust laws. The lawsuit claims that, as a result, Plaintiffs paid more for Pool Products than they otherwise would have paid. The Class Period is from 12-22-2007 to 12-21-2011. | **5-14-2015** | **For more information write to:**  **Herman, Herman & Katz LLC**  **820 O’Keefe Avenue**  **New Orleans, LA 70113**  **Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer**  **LLP**  **850 Third Avenue**  **14th Floor**  **New York, NY 10022** |
| **2-6-2015** | **12-MD-02328** | **(E.D. La.)** | **In re: Pool Products Distribution Market Antitrust Litigation (Pentair Water Pool & Spa, Inc., Hayward Industries, Inc., and Zodiac Pool Systems, Inc.**  Indirect-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that a class of individuals and businesses were injured by conspiracies among Defendants to violate certain state antitrust, unfair competition and consumer protection laws, resulting in artificially high prices for Pool Products purchased from 1-1-2008 to 7-16-2013. | **5-14-2015** | **For more information write to:**  **Herman, Herman & Katz LLC**  **820 O’Keefe Avenue**  **New Orleans, LA 70113**  **Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer**  **LLP**  **850 Third Avenue**  **14th Floor**  **New York, NY 10022** |
| **2-6-2015** | **13-CV-00183** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **In re: Star Scientific, Inc. Securities Litigation**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements regarding John Hopkins University School of Medicine’s purported involvement in pre-clinical and clinical studies of Star Scientific’s main product, Anatabloc®. Lead Plaintiff also alleges that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements about the regulatory status of Star Scientific’s two products Anatabloc® and CigRx®. The Class Period is from 5-10-2011 to 9-12-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Robbins Arroyo LLP**  **Stephen J. Oddo, Esq.**  **600 B Street**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **2-6-2015** | **13-CV-80670** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **De Los Santos v. Millward Brown, Inc.**  Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Millward violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) by making survey calls to certain cellular telephone numbers using an automatic telephone dialing system without the consent of the users or subscribers of those numbers. The Action was originally filed 7-9-2013, and seeks statutory damages against Defendant. The Class Period is from 7-9-2009 to date of preliminary approval. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:**  **Scott D. Owens**  **Law Office of Scott D.**  **Owens, Esq.**  **3800 S. Ocean Drive**  **Suite 235**  **Hollywood, FL 33019**  [**scott@scottdowens.com**](mailto:scott@scottdowens.com)  **Bret L. Lusskin, Esq.**  **20803 Biscayne Blvd.**  **Suite 302**  **Aventura, FL 33180**  [**blusskin@lusskinlaw.com**](mailto:blusskin@lusskinlaw.com) |
| **2-9-2015** | **12-MD-02409** | **(D. Mass.)** | **In re: Nexium (Esomeprazole Magnesium) Antitrust Litigation**  Direct Purchaser/End-Payer-plaintiffs allege that Dr. Reddy’s and its co-defendants violated federal antitrust laws by unlawfully delaying the introduction of generic versions of the prescription drug Nexium into the United States market causing injury to Plaintiffs and members of the class by causing them to pay higher prices for Nexium. The Class Period for Direct Purchasers is from 8-27-2008 to 12-11-2013 and for End Payers is from 4-14-2008 through and until the anticompetitive effects of Defendants’ unlawful conduct cease. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Thomas M. Sobol**  **Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP**  **55 Cambridge Parkway**  **Suite 301**  **Cambridge, MA 02142**  **617 482-3700**  **617 482-3003 (Fax)** |
| **2-11-2015** | **14-CV-14868** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **Office and Professional Employees International Union, Local 494, et al. v. UAW (United Auto Workers)**  Union-employee-plaintiffs allege that modifications were made by the International Union, United Auto, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (“UAW”), in 2013, to the prescription drug, dental and major medical benefits provided to eligible UAW retirees and surviving spouses, and to UAW active employees who could be eligible for such retirement benefits in the future. Two unions that represent employees of the UAW, the Office and Professional Employees International Union, Local 494 (“OPEIU”) and the Staff Council of International Representatives (“Staff Council”), filed grievances concerning the modifications, and the UAW responded that the changes were permissible and that the issue was not subject to arbitration.  Class Members are all who fit into any of the following categories and have been eligible for retiree medical benefits from the UAW: 1) Retirees from the UAW who were represented by a union and who retired prior to 6-2-2014, and their spouses, surviving spouses, and dependents; 2)Employees of the UAW who were not represented by a union as of 6-2-2014, or who retired prior to that date and were not represented by a union at the time of their retirement, and their spouses, surviving spouses, and dependents; and 3) Surviving spouses and dependents of UAW employees (whether or not represented by a union) who are eligible for retiree medical benefits from the UAW as a consequence of an employee’s death prior to retirement and prior to 6-2-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **David M. Cook**  **Jennie G. Arnold**  **Cook & Logothetis, LLC**  **22 West Ninth Street**  **Cincinnati, Ohio 45202** |
| **2-11-2015** | **06-CV-02376** | **(E.D. Cal.)** | **Jason Campbell and Sarah Sobek v. PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (“PwC”)**  Employee-plaintiffs allege that PwC misclassified them and the other Class Members as exempt employees and failed to pay them overtime wages and to provide other benefits they alleged were due to non-exempt employees. Specifically, Plaintiffs allege violations of California’s wage and hour laws, including Labor Code §§ 510 and 1994 (overtime), §§ 512 and 226.7 (meal and rest breaks), § 226 (itemized wage statements), and Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq. (unfair business practices). The Class Period is from 10-27-2002 to 7-23-2008. | **5-7-2015** | **For more information call or write:**  **Heffler Claims Group**  **1 844 274-4785**  **William A. Kershaw**  **Kershaw, Cutter &**  **Ratinoff LLP**  **401 Watt Avenue**  **Sacramento, CA 95864** |
| **2-12-2015** | **08-CV-8093** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Bear Stearns Mortgage Pass-Through Certificates Litigation**  Plaintiffs allege Bear Stearns sold certificates for residential mortgage backed securities (RMBS) with inflated investment ratings. The plaintiffs alleged that Moody’s and Standard & Poor’s misrepresented the quality of the certificates as well as the quality of the review process used to categorize the mortgage loans within risk pools causing the certificates to be graded much higher than the mortgage origination documents would support. The Class Persons are all who: (i) prior to 7-9- 2009, purchased or otherwise acquired offered RMBS pursuant or traceable to offerings BALTA 2006-5, BALTA 2006-6, BALTA 2006-7, BALTA 2006-8, BALTA 2007-1, BSARM 2006-4, BSARM 2007-1  (certificates backed by groups 1, 3 and 5 only), or BSARM 2007-3, and were damaged thereby;  (ii) prior to 8-20-2008, purchased or otherwise acquired offered RMBS pursuant or traceable to offering BSMF 2006-AR1, and were damaged thereby; or (iii) prior to 5-15-2009, purchased or otherwise acquired offered RMBS pursuant or traceable to offerings BSMF 2006-AR2, BSMF 2006-AR3, BSMF 2006-AR4, BSMF 2006-AR5, BSMF 2007-AR1, BSMF 2007-AR3, SAMI 2006-AR4, SAMI 2006-AR5, SAMI 2006-AR6, SAMI 2006-AR7, SAMI 2006-AR8, SAMI 2007-AR1 (certificates backed by group 1 only), or SAMI 2007-AR2 (certificates backed by group 1 only), and were damaged thereby. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Bernstein Litowitz Berger**  **& Grossmann LLP**  **David R. Stickney, Esq.**  **Niki L. Mendoza, Esq.**  **12481 High Bluff Drive**  **#300**  **San Diego, CA 92130**  **Cohen Milstein Sellers &**  **Tolls PLLC**  **Daniel S. Sommers, Esq.**  **1100 New York Avenue, N.W.**  **Suite 500 East**  **Washington, D.C. 20005** |
| **2-12-2015** | **12-CV-02169** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Sayan Aboudi, et al., v. T-Mobile, USA, Inc., et al.**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that T-Mobile violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act by using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice to place Collections Calls to wireless phones without the prior express consent of the recipients. The Class Period is from 9-4-2008 to 9-4-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Todd M. Friedman, Esq.**  **Law Offices of**  **Todd M. Friedman, P.C.**  **369 South Doheny Drive**  **Suite 415**  **Beverly Hills, CA 90211** |
| **2-13-2015** | **13-CV-7742** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Zidek, et al. v. Analgesic Healthcare, Inc., (AHC) et al.**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that they received unsolicited facsimile advertisements from AHC and that the sending of those faxes and others like it violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act, the Illinois Consumer Fraud Act and the Illinois common law (conversion, private nuisance and trespass to chattels). The Class Period is from 10-29-2009 to 12-15-2014. | **7-28-2015** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Daniel A. Edelman**  **Heather Kolbus**  **Edelman, Combs, Latturner**  **& Goodwin, LLC.**  **20 S. Clark Street**  **Suite 1500**  **Chicago, IL 60603**  **312 739-4200 (Ph.)**  **312 419-0379 (Fax)** |
| **2-13-2015** | **12-CV-00589** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **Tyron Henderson, et al. v. Acxiom Risk Mitigation, Inc., et al.**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that certain policies and practices of Defendants in connection with employment background reports prepared by Acxiom Information Security Services, Inc. or Sterling Infosystems-Ohio violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA). Specifically, the Lawsuit contends that Defendants violated the FCRA by: 1) failing to provide consumers with notice that they were furnishing an employment-purposed consumer report “at the time” they were doing so; 2) failing to follow proper procedures for resolving consumer disputes; and 3) failing to have a permissible purpose for issuing certain consumer reports to employers and vendors of Allstate Corporation. The Class Period is from 8-16-2007 to 5-1-2013. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Michael A. Caddell, Esq.**  **Caddell & Chapman**  **1331 Lamar Street**  **Suite 1070**  **Houston, TX 77010**  **713 751-0400 (Ph.)**  **713 751-0906 (Fax.)** |
| **2-19-2015** | **12-CV-9350** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Fox v. Riverview Realty Partners, et al.**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that: 1) Prime Group Realty Trust’s (“PGRT’s”) officers and directors breached their fiduciary duties by negotiating and approving the sale of the company’s common shares to Five Mile for $625,000, which was approved on 10-10-2011 and completed on 11-1-2011, and that Five Mile was unjustly enriched thereby; and 2) PGRT’s officers and directors, and Five Mile breached their fiduciary duties by agreeing to the 2012 Merger, through which Five Mile acquired the outstanding Series B Shares for $5.25 per share and PGRT was merged with and into Five Mile. The Class Period is from 10-10-2011 to 12-26-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Clint Krislov**  **Krislov & Associates, Ltd.**  **Civic Opera Building**  **Suite 1300**  **20 North Wacker Drive**  **Chicago, IL 60606**  **Robin B. Switzenbaum**  **Lawrence Deutsch**  **Jeffrey Osterwise**  **Berger & Montague, P.C.**  **1622 Locust Street**  **Philadelphia, PA 19103** |
| **2-19-2015** | **13-CV-03440** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: TracFone Unlimited Service Plan Litigation**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Straight Talk, Net10, Simple Mobile, and Telcel America advertised “unlimited” data plans, but then slowed or cut off data services, or terminated all services, for some customers. The “Defendants” are TracFone Wireless (which owns those four brands) and Wal-Mart. The Class Period is from 7-24-2009 to 12-31-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Michael W. Sobol**  **Lieff Cabraser Heimann &**  **Bernstein, LLP**  **275 Battery Street**  **29th Floor**  **San Francisco, CA 94111**  **Daniel M. Hattis**  **Hattis Law**  **2300 Geng Road**  **Suite 200**  **Palo Alto, CA 94303** |
| **2-19-2015** | **13-MD-02437** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **In re: Domestic Drywall Antitrust Litigation**  Direct-purchaser-plaintiffs and indirect-purchaser-plaintiffs of Gypsum Wallboard allege that Defendants conspired, in violation of the federal antitrust laws, to raise, fix, maintain or stabilize the price of gypsum wallboard and, to help further this price-fixing conspiracy, abolish the industry’s long-standing practice of limiting price increases for the duration of a construction project through the use of “job quotes.” The Class Period for both groups of plaintiffs is from 1-1-2012 to 11-30-2014. This notice was provided by Defendant TIN Inc. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Direct Purchaser**  **H. Laddie Montague, Jr.**  **Ruthanne Gordon**  **Michael C. Dell’Angelo**  **Candice J. Enders**  **Berger & Montague, P.C.**  **1622 Locust Street**  **Philadelphia, PA 19103**  **(215) 875-3000 (Ph.)**  **In-direct Purchaser**  **Block & Leviton LLP**  **155 Federal Street**  **Suite 400**  **Boston, MA 02110**  **617 398-5600 (Ph.)** |
| **2-20-2015** | **12-CV-6760** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Fernandez v. Knight Capital Group, Inc., et al.**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements regarding the Company’s business, operational and technology practices. Specifically, Defendants made false and/or misleading statements and/or failed to disclose: (i) that Knight lacked the deep liquidity it claimed to have and its capital position was not what the company purported it to be; (ii) that Knight’s trading technology and infrastructure were in fact not sophisticated and were not appropriately checked or tested to ensure they were working properly (as required by all high frequency broker-dealers with access to the markets); (iii) that the company lacked adequate internal and financial controls, and (iv) that, as a result of the above, Knight’s financial statements were materially false and misleading at all relevant times, and positive statements about the Company’s business prospects lacked a reasonable basis. The Class Period is from 5-10-2011 to 8-1-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello,**  **P.C.**  **James E. Cecchi**  **5 Becker Farm Road**  **Roseland, NJ 07068**  **973 994-1700 (Ph.)**  **Saxena White, P.A.**  **Lester R. Hooker**  **5200 town Center Circle**  **Suite 601**  **Boca Raton, FL 33486**  **561 394-3399 (Ph.)** |
| **2-20-2015** | **9-CV-00104** | **(M.D. Ala.)** | **In re: Colonial BancGroup, Inc. Securities Litigation**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs filed a Consolidated Class Action Complaint for Violations of the Federal Securities Laws (the “Consolidated Complaint”) on 6-22-2009 alleging violations of Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder and violations of Sections 11, 12(a)(2), and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 (the “Securities Act”). The Exchange Act claims alleged violations of the anti-fraud provisions of the securities laws arising from alleged misstatements and omissions made in connection with Colonial’s publicly-filed financials and other alleged misstatements made by Colonial’s senior officers. The Securities Act claims arise from the Stock Offering and the Note Offering conducted by the Company in April and March of 2008, respectively. The Class Period is from 4-18-2007 to 8-6-2009. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Labaton Sucharow LLP**  **James W. Johnson, Esq.**  **140 Broadway**  **New York, NY 10005** |
| **2-20-2015** | **13-MD-02437** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **In re: Domestic Drywall Antitrust Litigation**  See related 2-19-2015 Notice above.  Direct-purchaser-plaintiffs and indirect-purchaser-plaintiffs of Wallboard allege that U.S. Gypsum Company (collectively, “USG”) and other defendants engaged in an illegal conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain or stabilize the price of gypsum wallboard and, to help further this price-fixing conspiracy, abolish the industry’s long-standing practice of limiting price increases for the duration of a construction project through the use of “job quotes.” The Class Period is from 1-1-2012 to 11-30-2014. This notice was provided by Defendants USG Corporation and United States Gypsum Company. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or email:**  **H. Laddie Montague, Jr.**  **Ruthanne Gordon**  **Michael C. Dell’Angelo**  **Candice J. Enders**  **Berger & Montague, P.C.**  **1622 Locust Street**  **Philadelphia, PA 19103**  **215 875-3000 (Ph.)**  [**rgordon@bm.net**](mailto:rgordon@bm.net)  [**mdellangelo@bm.net**](mailto:mdellangelo@bm.net)  [**cenders@bm.net**](mailto:cenders@bm.net) |
| **2-23-2015** | **13-CV-02158** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Jekowsky v. BMW of North America, LLC**  Purchaser-plaintiff alleges that 296-Style wheels on BMW Z4 vehicles are defective because they may sustain cracks during normal driving conditions, upon contact with certain road conditions, or due to road debris. The lawsuit asserts claims against the authorized U.S. distributor of BMW vehicles, BMW of North America, LLC (“BMW NA”) for (1) violation of the Magnusson-Moss Warranty Act; (2) violation of the California Business & Professions Code section 17200 (“UCL”); (3) violation of the California Civil Code section 1750 et seq. (“CLA”); and (4) violation of express and implied warranties under the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act. The Class Vehicle is any 2009 through 2012 model year BMW Z4 vehicle that was sold or leased in the U.S. or Puerto Rico to residents of the U.S. or Puerto Rico and that either was equipped with BMW Style 296 wheels (“Class Wheels”) as original equipment, or that a Class Member equipped with Class Wheels post-purchase. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Bryan Kemnitzer**  **Nancy Barron**  **Kemnitzer Barron & Krieg**  **445 Bush Street**  **6th Floor**  **San Francisco, CA 94108**  **800 273-4566 (Ph.)**  **Please include the reference:**  **Jekowsky v. BMW** |
| **2-23-2015** | **14-CV-00551** | **(S.D. Ind.)** | **Robert Dubinski, et al. v. Sentry Insurance a Mutual Company**  Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that in 2013-2014 Sentry improperly non-renewed Indiana insureds with Payback® policies and that Sentry erred when it made the final Payback® refunds to certain insureds based only on the premiums paid in the policy year 2008-2009 or 2009-2010 depending upon the effective date of the non-renewal. | **5-27-2015** | **For more information write to:**  **Richard Shevitz**  **Cohen & Malad, LLP**  **One Indiana Square**  **Suite 1400**  **Indianapolis, IN 46204** |
| **2-23-2015** | **13-CV-1400** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Haight v. Bluestem Brands, Inc.**  Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Defendant Bluestem Brands, Inc., d/b/a Fingerhut, violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act(“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. §227, by using an automatic telephone dialing system and/or an artificial or prerecorded voice to call cell phones without prior express consent of the recipients. Class Members are all who received a non-emergency telephone call from Bluestem or on behalf of Bluestem to a cellular telephone through the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice in connection with attempt to collect on a Fingerhut, Gettington, or PayCheck Direct credit account debt from 9-11-2009 to 11-15-2015 (the Class Period). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or visit website:**  **Burke Law Offices, LLC**  **155 North Michigan Avenue**  **Suite 9020**  **Chicago, IL 60601**  [**www.BluestemTCPASettlement.com**](http://www.BluestemTCPASettlement.com) |
| **2-23-2014** | **08-CV-8781** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **New Jersey Carpenters Health Fund, et al. v. Residential Capital, LLC, et al.**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege claims under Sections 11, 12(a)(2), and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 (the “Securities Act”) for alleged misstatements and omissions in the Offering Materials for 13 offerings of mortgage asset-backed pass-through certificates. To determine the Class Period visit: [www.ralimbslitigation.com](http://www.ralimbslitigation.com) | **7-31-2015** | **For more information write to:**  **Cohen Milstein**  **Sellers & Toll**  **Joseph P. Laitman**  **Christopher Lometti**  **Michael Eisenkraft**  **Richard Speirs**  **Daniel B. Rehns**  **88 Pine Street**  **14th Floor**  **New York, NY 10005** |
| **2-23-2015** | **13-CV-00029** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **Thomas v. Backgroundchecks.com (“BGC”)**  Consumer-plaintiff alleges that BGC violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act by producing consumer reports without providing required notice to consumers and by producing consumer reports containing inaccurate information. The Plaintiff seeks actual damages, statutory damages, and punitive damages. The Class Period is from 1-1-2011 to 8-31-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Consumer Litigation**  **Associates, P.C.**  **Attn: Leonard A. Bennett**  **763 J Clyde Morris Blvd.**  **Suite 1A**  **Newport News, VA 23601** |
| **2-24-2015** | **09-CV-00104** | **(M.D. Ala.)** | **In re: Colonial BancGroup, Inc. Securities Litigation (Banc of America Securities LLC; Citigroup Global Markets Inc.; Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC; Deutsche Bank Securities Inc.; Morgan Keegan & Company, Inc.; Morgan Stanley & Co., Inc.; RBC Dain Rauscher Inc., Stifel, Nicolaus & Company, Inc.; SunTrust Robinson Humphrey, Inc.; USB Securities LLC; Wachovia Capital Markets, LLC; (the “Underwriter Defendants”) and PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges violations of Section 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder and violations of Sections 11, 12(a)(2), and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 (the “Securities Act”). The Exchange Act claims alleged violations of the anti-fraud provisions of the securities laws arising from alleged reports from 2-20-2015 misstatements and omissions made in connection with Colonial’s publicly-filed financials and other alleged misstatements made by Colonial’s senior officers. The Securities Act claims arise from the Stock Offering and the Note Offering conducted by the Company in April and March of 2008, respectively. The Class Period is from 4-18-2007 to 8-6-2009. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Labaton Sucharow LLP**  **James W. Johnson, Esq.**  **140 Broadway**  **New York, NY 10005** |
| **2-25-2015** | **13-CV-12276** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Miller v. Urban Outfitters, Inc.**  **Miller v. Free People, LLC, et al.**  Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Urban Outfitters violated Massachusetts General Laws c.93 § 105(a) based on Urban Outfitters’ alleged unlawful collection of ZIP codes in Massachusetts. Urban Outfitters allegedly used customers’ ZIP codes to identify their mailing addresses, to which Urban Outfitters sent marketing materials. The Class Period is from 8-15-2009 to [date of Preliminary Approval]. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **David Pastor**  **Pastor Law Office LLP**  **63 Atlantic Avenue**  **3rd Floor**  **Boston, MA 02110** |
| **2-27-2015** | **10-CV-3864** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Mary Jones v. Pfizer Inc., et al.**  Securities-plaintiff alleges Defendants misled investors by failing to disclose that they were engaged in an ongoing course of conduct designed to illegally promote the sale of Pfizer drugs. By such conduct, Pfizer caused hundreds of millions of dollars in false or fraudulent claims to be submitted to several federal healthcare programs, thus exposing the Company to untold legal liability. Specifically, defendants allegedly failed to disclose that Pfizer illegally promoted the sales and use of: (1) Bextra (from 1-1-2002 to 4-30-2005) for conditions (including acute pain and various types of surgical pain); (2) Geodon (from 2-1-2001 to 12-31-2007) for conditions (including depression, bipolar maintenance, mood disorder, anxiety, aggression, dementia, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, obsessive compulsive disorder, autism, and post-traumatic stress disorder); and (3)Zyvox (2-1-2001 to 2-28-2008) for conditions (including infections caused by MRSA generally, rather than only those types of MRSA for which Zyvox was FDA-approved). All were allegedly prescribed at dosages other than those for which their use was approved by the FDA. Pfizer also allegedly offered and paid illegal kickbacks to healthcare professionals to induce them to promote and prescribe the above. As a result of this alleged conduct, Pfizer knowingly caused false or fraudulent claims for Bextra, Geodon and Zyvox to be submitted to, or caused purchases by, Medicaid and other federal healthcare programs. The Class Period is from 1-19-2006 to 1-23-2009. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Robbins Geller Rudman &**  **Dowd LLP**  **Willow E. Radcliffe**  **Daniel J. Pfefferbaum**  **Matthew S. Melamed**  **Post Montgomery Center**  **One Montgomery Street**  **Suite 1800**  **San Francisco, CA 94104**  **415 288-4545 (Ph.)**  **415 288-4534 (Fax)** |
| **2-27-2015** | **06-CV-02674** | **(D. Ariz.)** | **Teamsters Local 617 Pension & Welfare Funds v. Apollo Group, Inc.**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendants participated in a scheme to defraud and made materially false and misleading statements regarding the granting of, and accounting for, stock options in violation of §10(b) and §20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. The Class Period is from 11-28-2001 to 10-18-2006. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Robbins Geller Rudman &**  **Dowd LLP**  **Jeffrey D. Light**  **655 West Broadway**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |