| **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name**  **Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **Website Link** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1-5-2016** | **15-CV-00393** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Federal Insurance Company v. Caldera Medical, Inc., et al.**  The claimants assert that Caldera manufactured, marketed, sold, and distributed transvaginal mesh (“TVM”) devices that it knew or should have known were hazardous and dangerous to patients who were implanted with them. As a result of the implantations of Caldera’s TVM devices, claimants suffered serious bodily injuries, including, but not limited to, extreme pain, erosion of internal bodily tissue, dyspareunia, painful scarring, and other injuries. Had Caldera properly disclosed risks associated with the products, claimants and their healthcare providers would not have used the products and claimants would not have suffered serious and permanent injuries. The Settlement Class is described as: (A) anyone who has filed a lawsuit asserting any claim against Caldera relating to injuries allegedly caused by a Caldera TVM device, or who has entered into a tolling agreement with Caldera relating to the filing of such claims, is automatically a member of the Settlement Class; and (B) if such an individual has not filed a lawsuit or entered into a tolling agreement, that individual may still be entitled to participate in the Settlement or if someone in the family was implanted with a TVM device manufactured, marketed, sold, or distributed by Caldera, and believe that the Caldera TVM device has caused any injuries. If the Court approves the Settlement, it will bar any person who has an actual or alleged Caldera TVM Claim as of the date of settlement approval from subsequently filing that claim in court. To obtain any payments relating to such an actual or alleged Caldera TVM Claim, that individual will need to join the Settlement Class and submit a Claim Form. | **Not set yet** | Prepared by Brenda Berkley  **For more information visit:**  [**www.ClosetMaidFCRAClassAction.com**](http://www.ClosetMaidFCRAClassAction.com) |
| **1-8-2016** | **14-CV-00268** | **(W.D. Wash.)** | **Rinky Dink, Inc. d/b/a Pet Stop, et al. v. World Business Lenders, LLC**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that World Business Lenders, LLC (“WBL”) (“Defendants”) violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) by using an automatic telephone dialing system to make calls to consumers’ cell phones. The class representatives also claim that WBL violated the Washington Automatic Dialing and Announcing Device statute (“WADAD”) by calling class members’ telephones using an artificial or prerecorded voice for the purpose of commercial solicitation. The class representatives claim that WBL did not have the consumers’ permission to make these calls. The Class Period is from 12-20-2015 to the execution date. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:**  **Terrell Marshall Law**  **Group PLLC**  **936 N. 34th Street**  **Suite 300**  **Seattle, WA 98103**  **206 816-6603 (Ph.)**  **206 319-5450 (Fax)**  [**info@terrellmarshall.com**](mailto:info@terrellmarshall.com) |
| **1-8-2016** | **08-CV-10783**  **10-CV-04429** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **NECA-IBEW Health & Welfare Fund v. Goldman, Sachs & Co., et al.**  **Police & Fire Retirement System of the City of Detroit v. Goldman, Sachs & Co., et al.**  **In re Defendants:**  **Goldman, Sachs & Co., Goldman Sachs Mortgage Company, GS Mortgage Securities Corp., Daniel L. Sparks, Michelle Gill, and Kevin Gasvoda (collectively, “Goldman Sachs”)**  These cases arise from the sale of certain residential mortgage-backed securities by Goldman Sachs entities during 2007 and 2008. Plaintiffs allege that the offering documents for the securities contained false and misleading statements about the underlying borrowers and collateral, thereby concealing the true nature, risk, and overall quality of the securities. The Initial Complaint asserted claims under Sections 11, 12 and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 (the "Securities Act") for material misrepresentations and omissions in GS Mortgage Securities Corp.'s January 31, 2007 Pre-Effective Amendment No. 1 to Form S-3 Registration Statement (Registration No. 333-139817) and its accompanying Prospectus Supplements ("Offering Documents") that were filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission between 2007 and 2008. The Settlement Class consists of all Persons who prior to 12-11-2008 purchased or otherwise acquired any of the Certificates in the Offerings and were damaged thereby. | **4-13-2016** | **For more information write to:**  **Robbins Geller**  **Rudman & Dowd LLP**  **Arthur C. Leahy**  **Lucas Olts**  **655 W. Broadway**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101**  **Sullivan & Cromwell**  **LLP**  **Richard H. Klapper**  **125 Broad Street**  **New York, NY 10004** |
| **1-13-2016** | **13-CV-07608** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: NQ Mobile, Inc. Securities Litigation**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that NQ and various other defendants had violated the federal securities laws by disseminating materially false or misleading information about the Company, its products and performance. The Class Period is from 3-6-2013 to 7-3-2014. | **3-11-2016** | **For more information write to:**  **William C. Fredericks**  **Scott + Scott, Attorneys**  **at Law, LLP**  **The Chrysler Building**  **405 Lexington Avenue**  **40th Floor**  **New York, NY 10174** |
| **1-14-2016** | **15-CV-00043** | **(W.D. Wis.)** | **Charvat, et al. v. National Guardian Life Insurance Company**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that telemarketing calls made on behalf of National Guardian by the codefendants violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 (the “TCPA”).  The Class Members are all persons in the United States whom, within four years prior to the filing of this action through the date of preliminary approval, Reid Lockhart, or any party on his behalf, called for the purposes of promoting National Guardian’s goods or services, either (a) on a residential or cellular telephone using a pre-recorded message or (b) more than once within any twelve-month period to phone numbers registered on the Do Not Call Registry. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Edward A. Broderick**  **Anthony I. Paronich**  **Broderick Law, P.C.**  **99 High St., Suite 304**  **Boston, MA 02110**  **Matthew P. McCue**  **The Law Office of**  **Matthew P. McCue**  **1 South Ave, Third Floor**  **Natick, MA 01760** |
| **1-15-2016** | **06-MD-1775** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendants:**  **Polar Air Cargo LLC (formerly known as Polar Air Cargo, Inc.), Polar Air Cargo Worldwide, Inc., and Atlas Air Worldwide Holdings, Inc.**  Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that the Defendants and certain of their employees conspired to fix, raise, maintain, or stabilize prices of Airfreight Shipping Services by, among other things, coordinating surcharges (such as fuel and security surcharges) and by agreeing to eliminate or prevent discounting of surcharges. The lawsuit claims that, as a result, purchasers paid more for Airfreight Shipping Services than they otherwise would have paid. The Class Period is from 1-1-2000 to 9-30-2006. | **3-24-2016** | **For more information call or visit:**  **1855 382-6460 (Ph.)**  [**www.aircargosettlement5.com**](http://www.aircargosettlement5.com) |
| **1-15-2016** | **13-CV-03476** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Nathanson v. Polycom, Inc., et al.**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges violations of the Federal Securities Laws (specifically Sections 10(b), 14(a) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. §§78j(b), 78(t)(a), and 78(n)) and Rules 10b-5, 14a-3 and 14a-9 promulgated thereunder (17 C.F.R. §§240.10b-5, 240.14a-3 and 240.14a-9). Plaintiff alleges that, during the Settlement Class Period, the price of Polycom’s securities was artificially inflated as a result of a series of allegedly untrue or materially misleading statements the Settling Defendants made concerning the compensation and expense submissions of Andrew Miller, at the time Polycom’s CEO, and concerning the company’s operating expenses. Lead Plaintiff further contends that the Settling Defendants made these statements knowing them to be false or misleading, or recklessly disregarding their false or misleading natures, and investors suffered injury as a result of the alleged inflation. The Class Period is from 1-20-2011 to 7-23-2013. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Jeremy A. Lieberman, Esq.**  **Pomerantz LLP**  **600 Third Avenue**  **New York, NY 10016** |
| **1-15-2016** | **15-CV-01252** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Nieyshia Patrick, et al. v. Interstate Management Company, LLC**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Defendant’s background check disclosure and authorization forms, and Defendant’s alleged procurement of consumer reports on the basis of the form(s), violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act. Based on these allegations, Plaintiff seeks statutory damages. The Class Period is from 5-22-2010 to 6-8-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Luis A. Cabassa, Esq.**  **Brandon J. Hill, Esq.**  **Wenzel Fento Cababba,**  **P.A.**  **1110 North Florida Avenue**  **Suite 300**  **Tampa, FL 33602** |
| **1-15-2016** | **13-CV-04980** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Yahoo Mail Litigation**  Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Yahoo violated California’s Invasion of Privacy Act (“CIPA”) as a matter of law because it intercepts and extracts the content of all incoming and outgoing email before the email is delivered to the recipient for the purpose of learning the meaning and content for its targeted advertising program. Plaintiff also alleges that Yahoo violated the federal Stored Communications Act (“SCA”) when it tested Google’s AdSense for Mail in 2013. The Class Period is from 10-2-2011 to Present. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Laurence D. King**  **Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer**  **LLP**  **350 Sansome Street**  **Suite 400**  **San Francisco, CA 94104**  **415 772-4700 (Ph.)**  **415 772-4707 (Fax)**  [**lking@kaplanfox.com**](mailto:lking@kaplanfox.com) |
| **1-19-2016** | **14-CV-00517** | **(M.D.N.C.)** | **Oliver v. FirstPoint, Inc.**  Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681, et seq. (the “FCRA”), in connection with preparing background reports. Specifically, the Plaintiff contends that the Defendant violated the FCRA by reporting criminal record information to employers or potential employers without either furnishing notice to the consumer of the fact of such reporting or maintaining strict procedures to ensure that the information was complete or up to date at the time the report was prepared. Class A is defined as follows: All natural persons residing in the United States (including all territories and other political subdivisions of the United States) (a) who were the subject of a consumer report sold by FirstPoint to a third party on or after 6-26-2012 to 9-16-2015, (b) furnished for an employment purpose, (c) where FirstPoint’s records indicate that the report involved a courthouse search for public records, (d) which report contained at least one criminal record hit, and (e) where no notice was sent under § 1681k(a)(1). Class B is defined as follows: All natural persons residing in the United States (including all territories and other political subdivisions of the United States) (a) who were the subject of an employment consumer report sold by FirstPoint to a third party and (b) where FirstPoint’s records indicate that the consumer filed a dispute with FirstPoint about the report on or after 7-27-2012 to 9-16-2015. | **5-3-2016** | **For more information write to:**  **Leonard A. Bennett**  **Consumer Litigation**  **Associates, P.C.**  **763 J. Clyde Morris Blvd 1A**  **Newport News, VA 23601**  **Matthew J. Erausquin**  **Consumer Litigation**  **Associates, P.C.**  **1800 Diagonal Road**  **Suite 600**  **Alexandria, VA 22314** |
| **1-19-2016** | **13-CV-08440** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Oklahoma Firefighters Pension & Retirement System and Oklahoma Law Enforcement Retirement System v. Ixia, Victor Alston, Atul Bhatnagar, Thomas B. Miller, and Errol Ginsberg (collectively “Defendants”)**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that Defendants made misrepresentations or omissions of material facts concerning Ixia’s financial condition in violation of section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and SEC Rule 10b-5 thereunder. The complaint further alleged that the Individual Defendants violated section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. The Class Period is from 2-4-2011 to 4-3-2013. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **James J. Sabella, Esq.**  **Grant & Eisenhofer P.A.**  **485 Lexington Avenue**  **29th Floor**  **New York, New York 10017** |
| **1-21-2016** | **13-CV-5206** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Adam Jones v. Bath & Body Works, Inc.**  Employee-plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the California wage and hour laws on a class-wide basis as to all current and former Sales Associates, including: (1) failure to pay wages for hours worked, including without limitation unpaid overtime, unpaid reporting time, and unpaid call-in time; (2) failure to provide meal periods; (3) failure to authorize and permit rest breaks; (4) failure to provide accurate, itemized wage statements; (5) failure to timely pay wages during employment and upon termination; (6) violations of unfair competition law, and (7) civil penalties based on these alleged violations. Another former Bath & Body Works Sales Associate subsequently pursued similar claims for civil penalties. The Class Period is from 6-4-2009 to 9-30-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:**  **Capstone Law APC**  **Paul Perez**  **Melissa Grant**  **Arnab Banerjee**  **1840 Century Park East**  **Suite 450**  **Los Angeles, CA 90067**  [**Raul.Perez@capstonelawyers.com**](mailto:Raul.Perez@capstonelawyers.com)  [**Melissa.Grant@capstonelawyers.com**](mailto:Melissa.Grant@capstonelawyers.com)  [**Arnab.Banerjee@capstonelawyers.com**](mailto:Arnab.Banerjee@capstonelawyers.com) |
| **1-21-2016** | **13-CV-03567** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Vocera Communications, Inc. Securities Litigation**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges violations of the federal securities laws by Vocera Communications, Inc., certain individual officers and directors of the Company, and certain investment banks that served as underwriters in connection with the Company's initial public offering (collectively, "Defendants"). Plaintiff also asserts violations of Section 11 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1933 (the “Securities Act”) by Vocera, the Individual Defendants, certain of Vocera’s directors, as well as J.P. Morgan Securities LLC, Piper Jaffray & Co., Robert W. Baird & Co., William Blair & Company, LLC, Wells Fargo Securities, LLC, and Leerink Partners LLC (the “Underwriters”); violations of Section 12(a)(2) of the Securities Act by Vocera, as well as the Underwriters; violations of Section 15 of the Securities Act by the Individual Defendants and certain of Vocera’s directors; violations of Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) by Vocera and the Individual Defendants; and violations of Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act by the Individual Defendants. The Class Period is from 3-28-2012 to 5-2-2013. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Labaton Sucharow LLP**  **Jonathan Gardner**  **Carol C. Villegas**  **140 Broadway**  **New York, NY 10005**  **212 907-0700 (Ph.)**  **212 818-0477 (Fax)** |
| **1-21-2016** | **12-CV-12020** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Residential Capital, LLC**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that GMAC Mortgage, LLC. (“GMACM”) conspired with the Balboa Insurance Company, Meritplan Insurance Company, Newport Management Company, QBE Insurance Corporation, Praetorian Insurance Company, QBE Specialty Insurance Company, QBE First Insurance Agency, Inc., and QBE First Institutional Risk Services, Inc., (the “Boalboa Defendants”) to devise and carry out a scheme to defraud borrowers by inflating the amounts that borrowers purportedly owed in reimbursements in connection with Lender-Placed Insurance on loans serviced by GMACM. The Named Plaintiffs also allege that GMACM received kickbacks from the Balboa Defendants. The Class Period is from 2-3-2004 to 10-2-2013. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Mark A. Strauss, Esq.**  **Thomas W. Elrod, Esq.**  **Kirby McInerney LLP**  **825 Third Avenue**  **New York, NY 10022** |
| **1-22-2016** | **07-CV-9227** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Rodriguez, et al. v. It’s Just Lunch International, et al.**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that It’s Just Lunch violated New York law and unjustly enriched itself by charging greater than $1,000 for one year’s worth of its services in New York. The Plaintiffs also claim that It’s Just Lunch fraudulently induced clients into signing a membership contract. For settlement purposes, the United States District Court has decided that everyone who fits one or both of the following categories is a Class Member: (i) all individuals who became clients of It’s Just Lunch in New York and who, on or after October 15, 2001, paid more than $1,000 for a year’s worth of services at the time of initial contracting; and (ii) all people who signed a membership contract with It’s Just Lunch and purchased It’s Just Lunch’s services in one of 49 states or D.C., on or after that state’s corresponding earliest qualifying date, provided the person did not receive a full refund and/or did not release his or her claims against It’s Just Lunch or one of its franchisees. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write or visit:**  **Balestriere Fariello**  **It’s Just Lunch**  **Class Action**  **225 Broadway, 29th Floor**  **New York, NY 10007**  **WWW.IJLCLASSACTION.COM** |
| **1-22-2016** | **14-CV-07457** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **McGreevy v. Life Alert Emergency Response, Inc.**  This class action involves current and former Life Alert “direct seller” salespersons who were classified as independent contractors. The action seeks unpaid minimum and overtime wages on behalf of these persons. Members of the settlement classes include all current and former Life Alert “direct seller” salespersons who: (1) worked in New York and were classified as independent contractors at any time from 9-15-2008 through [date of preliminary approval order] (the “New York class”); (2) worked in Florida and were classified as independent contractors at any time from 9-15-2009 through [date of preliminary approval order] (the “Florida class”); and (3) opted-in to the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”) collective action (the “FLSA class”) no later than 10-1-2015 and within three years of their last date of working for Life Alert as a salesperson. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or visit:**  **Rachel Bien**  **Melissa L. Stewart**  **Chauniqua D. Young**  **Outten & Golden LLP**  **3 Park Avenue**  **29th Floor**  **New York, N.Y. 10016**  **212 245-1000 (Ph.)**  [**LifeAlertCase@outtengolden.com**](mailto:LifeAlertCase@outtengolden.com) |
| **1-22-2016** | **14-CV-03205** | **(D. Md.)** | **Bergman, et al. v. DAP Products Inc.**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that some of the advertisements for the XHose, XHose Pro and XHose Pro Extreme garden hoses (collectively the “Covered Products”) were false and misleading and that the Covered Products are defective, and that Defendants have breached express and implied warranties that apply to the Covered Products. The Class Period is from 1-1-2012 to date of Preliminary Approval Order. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion call or visit:**  **1 866 545-1007 (Ph.)**  [**www.xhoseclasssettlement.com**](http://www.xhoseclasssettlement.com) |
| **1-25-2016** | **11-CV-2613**  **11-MDL-2262** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **FTC Capital GmbH v. Credit Suisse Group AG**  **In re: LIBOR-Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litigation – Exchange-Based Plaintiffs Action – Barclays Settlement**  Plaintiffs have alleged, among other things, that Barclays: (i) violated Sections 9(a) and 22(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act, 7 U.S.C. §§ 13(a) and 25(a) by manipulating and aiding and abetting in manipulation of the U.S. Dollar London Interbank Offered Rate (“LIBOR”) rate and Eurodollar futures prices, (ii) incurred vicarious liability under Section 2(a)(1) of the Commodity Exchange Act, 7 U.S.C. § 2(a)(1) by manipulative acts of employees, (iii) violated Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1 by conspiring to manipulate the U.S. Dollar LIBOR rate; and (iv) was unjustly enriched as a result of its allegedly manipulative acts in connection with U.S. Dollar LIBOR. Exchange-Based Plaintiffs further contend that they suffered monetary damages as a result of Barclays’ conduct. The Class Period is from 1-1-2005 to 5-31-2010. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:**  **Christopher Lovell**  **Lovell Stewart Halebian Jacobson LLP**  **61 Broadway**  **Suite 501**  **New York, NY 10006**  [**clovell@llp.com**](mailto:clovell@llp.com)  **David E. Kovel**  **Kirby McInerny LLP**  **825 Third Avenue**  **16th Floor**  **New York, NY 10022**  [**dkovel@kmllp.com**](mailto:dkovel@kmllp.com) |
| **1-25-2016** | **13-CV-00172** | **(D. Nab.)** | **Cullan and Cullan LLC v. m-Qube, Inc.**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Media Breakaway charged wireless subscribers for Mobile Content that they did not authorize. Similar lawsuits were filed against Media Breakaway, and are pending in state and federal courts, including in California. The class action asserts claims for restitution/unjust enrichment and tortious interference with a contract and seeks monetary as well as injunctive relief. The Class Period is from 1-1-2010 to date of Preliminary Approval Order. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Richard J. Schicker**  **Bar No. 13686**  **Law Offices of**  **Richard J. Schicker**  **2809 So. 160th Street Suite 101**  **Omaha, NE 68130** |
| **1-25-2016** | **14-CV—3224** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **Sherry L. Bodnar v. Bank of America, N.A.**  Consumer-plaintiff asserts the following claims against Bank of America: (1) breach of the agreement governing consumer deposit account; (2) breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; (3) unjust enrichment; (4) conversion; and (5) violation of the Pennsylvania Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law (the “UTPCPL”). Specifically, this action arises from overdraft fees charged on transactions that were authorized when the customer’s available balance was sufficient but which settled when the available balance was insufficient. The Class Period is from 5-25-2011 to date of Preliminary Approval. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **Hassan Zavareei**  **Jeffrey Kaliel**  **Tycko & Zavareei LLP**  **2000 L Street, NW**  **Suite 808**  **Washington, DC 20036**  **Jeffrey M. Ostrow**  **Kopelowitz Ostrow P.A.**  **1 West Las Olas Blvd.**  **Suite 500**  **Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301**  **James Shah**  **Shepard, Finkelman et al.**  **475 White Horse Pike**  **Collingswood, NJ 08107** |
| **1-25-2016** | **12-CV-01894** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **I.B., et al. v. Facebook, Inc.**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that there were violations of the California Family Code §§ 6701 to 6710 in connection with minor users’ purchases of virtual goods in applications on Facebook’s website. On 3-10-2015, the court certified a class under Fed. R. Civ. P. § 23(b)(2) consisting of “All Facebook users who are or were minor children according to Facebook’s own records for the four years preceding the date on which the original complaint was filed (2-23-2012) through the date on which a class is certified (3-10-2015) (“the Minor Class”). Within the Minor Class is a subclass of Minors from whose Facebook accounts Facebook Credits were purchased (“the Minor Purchasing Subclass”). |  | **For more information write, call fax or e-mail:**  **C. Brooks Cutter**  **John R. Parker, Jr.**  **Kershaw, Cutter & Ratinoff, LLP**  **401 Watt Avenue**  **Sacramento, CA 95864**  **916 448-9800 (Ph.)**  **916 669-4499 (Fax)**  [**bcutter@kcrlegal.com**](mailto:bcutter@kcrlegal.com)  [**jparker@kcrlegal.com**](mailto:jparker@kcrlegal.com) |
| **1-25-2016** | **14-CV-12409** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Gornstein v. TimberTech Ltd. and CPG International, Inc.**  Purchaser-plaintiff alleges thatTimberTech XLM Mountain Cedar decking sold on or before 8-31-2010 and XLM Desert Bronze sold on or before 11-1-2011 are subject to a defect that can cause the decking to, among other things, scorch (i.e., blacken) or fade (i.e., whiten) or manifest a surface film (i.e., blister). The Lawsuit asserts a variety of claims against Defendants concerning the purported defects. The Class is described as all who own XLM Mountain Cedar decking purchased on or before 8-31-2010, or XLM Desert Bronze purchased on or before 11-1-2011, or who received a permitted assignment. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call:**  **William Anderson of Cuneo**  **Gilbert & LaDuca, LLP**  **202 789-3960 (Ph.)** |
| **1-25-2016** | **15-CV-75** | **(M.D. Ga.)** | **Brandi Edwards v. Phoebe Putney Health System, Inc. et al.**  This lawsuit claims that Phoebe Putney Health System, Inc. (“PPHS”) and the Plan (the “Defendants”) breached certain fiduciary duties owed to the Plan and the Plan’s participants under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended, (“ERISA”). The Class Period is from 5-1-2009 to 12-31-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Norris A. Adams, II**  **Essex Richards, P.A.**  **1701 South Boulevard**  **Charlotte, NC 28203** |
| **1-25-2015** | **15-CV-493** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **Tony M. Townsend v. AIM Integrated Logistics, Inc.**  Consumer-plaintiff alleges that AIM did not comply with the Fair Credit Reporting Act (“FCRA”) in the manner in which it obtained and/or relied upon or used the consumer reports of applicants for employment with AIM. The Class Period is from 3-13-2010 11-15-2015. | **5-12-2016** | **For more information write, call or fax**  **Matthew A. Dooley**  **Anthony R. Pecora**  **5455 Detroit Road**  **Sheffield Village OH 44054**    **440 930-4001 (Ph.)**  **440 394-7208 (Fax.)** |
| **1-26-2016** | **14-CV-01686** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Ly v. AT&T Mobility LLC, et al.**  Employee-plaintiff alleges that AT&T Mobility Services owes unpaid wages to current and former Retail Sales Consultants (“RSCs”) and Assistant Store Managers (“ASMs”) in California during the class period of 4-30-2010 to date of Preliminary Approval Order. In summary, Plaintiff alleges that RSCs and ASMs worked off-the-clock because of certain work and post-shift activity. Plaintiff also alleges that AT&T Mobility Services failed to pay the proper amount of premium pay for missed meal and rest periods. Plaintiff also alleges that AT&T Mobility Services did not provide all of the required information on wage statements provided to employees. Plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint alleges the following causes of action on a putative class action basis: (1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages; (2) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages; (3) Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods; (4) Failure to Provide Meal Periods; (5) Failure to Pay Wages Timely Upon Separation of Employment; (6) Failure to Provide and Maintain Compliant Itemized Wage Statements; (7) Unfair Business Practices in Violation of Business & Professions Code Section 17200; and (8) Failure to Pay Minimum Wage and Overtime under the Fair Labor Standards Act. The Complaint also alleges claims under the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (PAGA). Plaintiff seeks a monetary recovery on behalf of the class for the alleged violations, along with interest, costs and fees. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Matthew S. Dente**  **Dente Law, P.C.**  **600 B Street**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101**  **619 550-3475 (Ph.)**  **Brian J. Robbins**  **Robbins Arroyo LLP**  **600 B Street**  **San Diego, CA 92101**  **619 525-3990 (Ph.)** |
| **1-28-2016** | **12-CV-3704** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Fernanda Garber, Marc Lerner, Derek Rasmussen, Robert Silver, Garrett Traub, and Vincent Birbiglia v. Office of the Commissioner of Baseball, et al.**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated federal law by agreeing to allocate the country into territories and prohibit any Major League Baseball team from distributing broadcasts outside its specified territory. Plaintiffs claim that this caused inflated prices for live baseball broadcasts and limited consumer options for viewing baseball broadcasts. The Class Period is from 5-9-2008 to 1-18-2016. | **4-25-2016** | **For more information write to:**  **Edward Diver**  **Howard I. Langer**  **Peter Leckman**  **LANGER, GROGAN & DIVER,**  **P.C.**  **1717 Arch Street**  **Suite 4130**  **Philadelphia, PA 19103** |
| **1-28-2016** | **14-CV-00959** | **(N.D. Tex.)** | **In re: 2014 RadioShack ERISA Litigation**  Plan-participant-plaintiffs allege that the Trustee Defendants and Non-Settling Defendants violated ERISA by, among other things, failing to disregard directions from the Plans’ investment committee to invest the Plans’ assets in the RadioShack Stock Fund during the Class Period when the Trustee Defendants knew or should have known RadioShack Stock was an imprudent Plan investment option. Named Plaintiffs allege that the Trustee Defendants and Non-Settling Defendants knew or should have known that RadioShack Stock was imprudent due to, inter alia: (a) the massive consumer shift away from brick-and-mortar stores like RadioShack towards online retailers; (b) the drastic deterioration in consumer demand for RadioShack’s outdated products and services; (c) because of the Company’s shift to low margin sales, the inability to replace declining customer demand for traditional high-margin items; and (d) the severely deteriorating financial condition of the Company, including the collapse of the RadioShack Stock price, which inevitably led to the Company’s bankruptcy. The Class Period is from 11-30-2011 to date of Preliminary Approval Order. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Edward W. Ciolko**  **Mark K. Gyandoh**  **KESSLER TOPAZ MELTZER & CHECK, LLP**  **280 King of Prussia Road**  **Radnor, PA 19087**  **610 667-7706 (Ph.)**  **610 667-7056 (Fax)**  **Gerald D. Wells, III**  **Robert J. Gray**  **CONNELLY WELLS & GRAY LLP**  **2200 Renaissance Bovd.**  **Suite 308**  **King of Prussia, PA 19406**  **610 822-3700 (Ph.)**  **610 822-3800 (Fax)** |
| **1-28-2016** | **14-CV-01846** | **(N.D. Ga.)** | **Mey v. Interstate National Dealer Services, Inc., All American Auto Protection, Inc., David Cunningham, and US Direct Protect**  Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 (the “TCPA”), by making calls to: (a) telephone numbers listed on the National Do Not Call Registry; and (b) wireless telephone numbers. The Class Period is from 6-12-2010 to date of Preliminary Approval Order. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Edward Broderick**  **Anthony Paronich**  **BRODERICK LAW, P.C.**  **99 High St., Suite 304**  **Boston, MA 02110**  **Matthew P. McCue**  **THE LAW OFFICE OF**  **MATTHEW P. MCCUE**  **1 South Avenue**  **Suite 3**  **Natick, MA 01760** |
| **1-29-2016** | **15-CV-03813** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Firerock Global Opportunity Fund LP v. Rubicon Technology, Inc., et al.**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges, among other things, that the Rubicon’s registration statement, prospectus, and prospectus supplement (collectively, the “Registration Statement”) which became effective 12 days before the end of the first quarter of 2014, failed to disclose material information necessary to make the statements made not misleading and failed to disclose material trends, events, and uncertainties that were known to management and were reasonably expected to have a material impact on the Company’s income from continuing operations, as required by Item 303 of SEC Regulation S-K. In particular, Lead Plaintiff further alleges that the Registration Statement, by incorporating SEC filings that reflected trends of shrinking losses and costs, failed to disclose that these trends had reversed during the first quarter of 2014. Lead Plaintiff further alleges that the Registration Statement failed to disclose significant development costs and risks associated with Rubicon’s new and highly touted patterned sapphire substrates (“PSS”) product and also failed to disclose that the Company was selling certain products at or below cost, which would result in a material inventory write-off. Finally, Lead Plaintiff alleges that the “risk factors” in the Registration Statement regarding costs, inventory write-offs, and the PSS product were false and misleading because they only warned of what might occur if certain contingencies were met; they did not make clear that such contingencies had, in fact, already manifested. Lead Plaintiff alleges that Defendants’ allegedly false and misleading statements and omissions artificially inflated the price of Rubicon common stock and when the truth was eventually disclosed, resulted in substantial damages to the Class. The Class is described as all persons who purchased the common stock of Rubicon pursuant to the Company’s public offering on or about 3-9-2014. | **5-20-2016** | **For more information write to:**  **ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN &**  **DOWD LLP**  **Jeffrey D. Light**  **655 West Broadway**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101**  **ABRAHAM, FRUCHTER &**  **TWERSKY, LLP**  **Jack G. Fruchter**  **One Penn Plaza**  **Suite 2805**  **New York, NY 10119** |
| **1-29-2016** | **15-CV-60716** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Muransky v. Godiva Chocolatier, Inc.**  Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Godiva willfully violated the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act (“FACTA”) by printing credit card and debit card transaction receipts at certain of its stores in the United States that included more than the last 5 digits of the credit or debit card number, between 4-6-2013 and 11-20-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call:**  **Scott D. Owens**  **Scott D. Owens, P.A.**  **3800 S. Ocean Drive**  **Suite 235**  **Hollywood, FL 33019** |
| **1-29-2016** | **11-CV-4052**  **12-CV-07300** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Schwartz v. Avis Rent A Car System, LLC**  **Klein v. Budget Rent A Car System, Inc.**  Renter-plaintiffs allege that Avis and Budget improperly charged frequent traveler program surcharges (or “FTP Surcharges”) to members of the Avis Preferred Service Program and the Budget Rapid Rez with Fastbreak Program in connection with online rental vehicle reservations where renters received frequent-flyer miles from Avis and Budget travel partners. The Class Period for Avis - 7-14-2005 to 6-14-2012 and for Budget - 11-27-2006 to 2-17-2013. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Daniel R. Karon, Esq.**  **Karon LLC**  **700 West St. Clair Avenue**  **Suite 200**  **Cleveland, OH 44113**  **Bruce D. Greenberg, Esq.**  **Lite DePalma Greenberg,**  **LLC**  **570 Broad Street**  **Suite 1201**  **Newark, NJ 07102** |