|  **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name**  **Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **Website Link** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **6-1-2015** | **09-CV-00852** | **(E.D. Wis.)** | **Fond du Lac Bumper Exchange Inc. v. Jui Li Enterprise Co., Ltd., et al.**Indirect-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that beginning 1-1-2003, Defendants violated federal and state antitrust laws and other state laws by agreeing to fix prices and limit supply for Aftermarket Automotive Sheet Metal Products. The Class Period is from 1-1-2003 to date of preliminary approval. | **9-10-2015** | **For more information write to:****Ben Barnow****Barnow and Associates,** **P.C.****One North LaSalle Street****Suite 4600****Chicago, IL 60602** |
| **6-1-2015** | **13-MDL-2389****12-CV-4054****12-CV-4200****12-CV-4201****12-CV-4315****12-CV-4403****12-CV-4600****12-CV-4716****12-CV-5549****12-CV-5630****12-CV-6439****12-CV-6882** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Facebook, Inc., IPO Securities and** **Derivative Litigation****Goldberg, et al. v. NASDAQ OMX Group, Inc. and** **The Nasdaq Stock Market LLC (the "Nasdaq** **Actions”)****Yan v. Nasdaq Actions****Alfonso, et al. v. Nasdaq Actions****Levy v. Nasdaq Actions****Amin v. Nasdaq Actions****Steinman v. Nasdaq Actions****Roderick v. Nasdaq Actions****McGinty v.** **Nasdaq Actions** **First New York Securities L.L.C., et al. v.** **Nasdaq Actions** **Zack v. Nasdaq Actions****Egan v.** **Nasdaq Actions**Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Nasdaq Defendants acted negligently and in violation of the federal securities laws in connection with Facebook's IPO on 5-18-2012, and that retail investors in Facebook common stock that day suffered damages as a result of that conduct. The Class consists of all persons and entities that entered retail pre-market and aftermarket orders to purchase and/or sell the common stock of Face book on 5-18-2012. | **9-16-2015**Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more information write to:****Vincent R. Cappucci****Entwistle & Cappucci LLP****280 Park Avenue****26th Floor West****New York, NY 10017** |
| **6-1-2015** | **14-CV-01022** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Zachary Goodman and Derrick Sims v. Hangtime, Inc., and Buc Mobile, Inc. d/b/a Hook Mobile**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Defendants sent unsolicited text messages to cellular telephones without the owners' consent. The text messages promoted the mobile application Hangtime. The lawsuit alleges Defendants violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act because consumers did not agree to receive these text messages. The Class Period is from 3-1-2013 to date of preliminary approval. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call or visit:****1 866 354-3015 (Ph.)**[**www.HangtimeTextSettlement.com**](http://www.HangtimeTextSettlement.com) |
| **6-4-2015** | **14-CV-01549** | **(D.D.C.)** | **Wilfredo Arocho v. Pepco Holdings, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Pepco Holdings, Inc. ("PHI") violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act ("FCRA") and the New Jersey Fair Credit Reporting Act ("NJFCRA"), by obtaining a "consumer report," for employment purposes. The Class Period is from 9-11-2012 to 10-10-2014.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Class Action** **Administration, Inc.****6521 West 91st Avenue****Westminster, CO 80031****720 540-4422 (Ph.)** |
| **6-5-2015** | **13-CV-08773** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Jemuel Andres, Mark Takahashi and Christine Bohlander v. Laboratory Corporation of America**Employee-plaintiffs allege that LabCorp violated California state labor laws due to its alleged failure, among other things, to: (1) pay overtime wages; (2) provide meal and rest periods; (3) timely pay wages during employment; (4) timely pay wages upon discharge or termination of employment; and (5) provide accurate, itemized wage statements. The Class Period is from 6-6-2009 to 4-16-2012. | **10-29-2015** | **For more information write to:****Capstone Law APC****Robert Drexler****1840 Century Park East****Suite 450****Los Angeles, CA 90067** |
| **6-5-2015** | **07-CV-05944** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litigation (Toshiba Corporation, Toshiba America, Inc., Toshiba America Electronic Components, Inc., Toshiba America Consumer Products, L.L.C., and Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc. (collectively the “Toshiba Defendants"))**Indirect-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendants fixed the prices of CRTs, which resulted in overcharges to consumers and businesses that bought CRTs and products containing CRTs, such as televisions and computer monitors. The Class Period is from 3-1-1995 to 11-25-2007. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.CRTclaims.com**](http://www.CRTclaims.com) |
| **6-5-2015** | **07-CV-05944** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: CRT Antitrust Litigation (Samsung SDI Co. Ltd., Samsung SDI America, Inc., Samsung SDI Basil, Ltd., Tianjin Samsung SDI Co., Ltd., Shenzhen Samsung SDI Co., Ltd., Samsung SDI Malaysia Sdn. Bhd. and Samsung SDI Mexico S.A. de C.V. (collectively "Samsung SDI"))**See CAFA Notice above. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call or visit:****1800 649-8153 (Ph.)**[**www.CRTsettlement.com**](http://www.CRTsettlement.com) |
| **6-5-2015** | **12-CV-249** | **(D. Minn.)** | **Tim George, et al. v. Uponor, Inc., et al.**Property-owner-plaintiffs allege that Uponor Yellow Brass Fittings and components made from high zinc content brass were defectively designed and prematurely corrode (or break down) when drinking water supplied by the Southern Nevada Water Authority runs through them. This chemical process is called "dezincification." The lawsuit also claims that when the high zinc content brass is exposed to this water over time, it becomes blocked, cracks, weeps, seeps, and/or leaks and may affect the water supply. There are no known water quality issues concerning the drinkability of the water supplied by the Southern Nevada Water Authority. The Class is defined as all who owned or later own: buildings, Common Areas, Residential Units, or Non-Residential Properties located in the Las Vegas Valley, which contain (or contained) Uponor Yellow Brass Fittings.  | **9-9-2015** | **For more information call or visit:****1 888 227-9828 (Ph.)**[**www.BrassFittingsClass.com**](http://www.BrassFittingsClass.com) |
| **6-5-2015** | **11-CV-3480** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Estakhrian v. Obenstine, et al.**Purchaser-plaintiff alleges that the Defendants breached their fiduciary duties and committedmalpractice, and otherwise engaged in unlawful conduct, in representing a class of individuals who put earnest money deposits toward the purchase of units in the Cosmopolitan but only received a partial refund of their deposit through the Wattlitigation. Plaintiff contends that the King and Spalding LLP Defendants acted as attorneys for the class in the Wattaction. In preliminarily approving the settlement, the Court defined the Class for purposes of this settlement only to include all class members (i.e., those individuals who did not opt out) inDaniel Watt, et al. v. Nevada Property 1, LLC, et al., Nevada District Court, Case No.A582541.  | **Not Set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or visit:****Irvine Law Group, LLP****S. Ron Alikani****7700 Irvine Center Drive****Suite 800****Irvine, CA 92618****949 653-6153 (Ph.)****949 653-1277 (Fax)****ralikani@irvinelawgroup.com** |
| **6-5-2015** | **12-MD-02320** | **(D.N.H.)** | **In re: Colgate-Palmolive Soft Soap Antibacterial Hand Soap Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendant used deceptive labeling and marketing of the Product that was based on “99%” efficacy without an accompanying disclosure statement that generally describes testing methods at a level consistent with those appearing on Product labels as of 5-19-2015. The Class Period is from 1-1-1992 to date of preliminary approval. |  | **For more information write, call, fax or email:****Lucy J. Karl** **Shaheen & Gordon, P.A.****107 Storrs Street****P.O. Box 2703****Concord, NH 03303****603 225-7262 (Ph.)****603 225-5112 (Fax)****lkarl@shaheengordon.com** |
| **6-5-2015** | **14-CV-01243** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Al and Po Corporation, et al. v. Quality Medical Products, LLC**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Quality Medical Products, LLC (QMP) violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA") by sending unsolicited fax ads. The Class is defined as all persons and entities who in 2013 were subscribers to a telephone number to which one or more facsimiles was sent. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or visit:****Siprut PC****17 N. State Street****Suite 1600****Chicago, IL 60602****312 236-0000 (Ph.)**[**www.siprut.com**](http://www.siprut.com) |
| **6-8-2015** | **07-CV-05944** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Cathode Ray Tube CRT Antitrust Litigation (Koninklijke Philips N.V., Philips Electronics North America Corporation, Philips Taiwan Ltd., and Philips do Brasil, Ltda. (collectively "Philips"))**See CAFA Notice dated 6-5-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call or visit:****1 800 649-8153 (Ph.)**[**www.CRTsettlement.com**](http://www.CRTsettlement.com) |
| **6-8-2015** | **07-CV-05944** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Cathode Ray Tube CRT Antitrust Litigation (Hitachi, Ltd. ("HTL"), Hitachi Displays, Ltd. (n/k/a Japan Display Inc.) ("HDP"), Hitachi Asia, Ltd ("HAS"), Hitachi America, Ltd.** **("HAL"), and Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc. ("HED(US)") (collectively, the "Hitachi Defendants"))**See CAFA Notice dated 6-5-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call or visit:****1 800 649-8153 (Ph.)****www.CRTsettlement.com** |
| **6-8-2015** | **07-CV-05944** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Cathode Ray Tube CRT Antitrust Litigation (Panasonic Corporation of North America, MT Picture Display Co., Ltd. and Panasonic Corporation (f/k/a Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.) (collectively, "Panasonic"))**See CAFA Notice dated 6-5-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call or visit:****1 800 649-8153 (Ph.)****www.CRTsettlement.com** |
| **6-8-2015** | **13-CV-02529** | **(M.D. Pa.)** | **Amador v. The Brickman Group, Ltd., LLC**Employee-plaintiff asserts for all employees of The Brickman Group, Ltd., LLC (“Defendant”) who were paid on a fluctuating work week basis: 1) a failure to pay overtime wages under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq. ("FLSA"); 2) a failure to pay overtime wages under the Pennsylvania Minimum Wage Act of 1968, 43 P.S. §§ 333.101, et seq. ("PMWA"); 3) an intentional failure to pay wages under the Pennsylvania Wage Payment and Collection Law, 43 Pa.C.S. § 260.1 ("PWPCL"); and 4) a Pennsylvania common law claim of unjust enrichment. Plaintiff sought collective action status under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) and a Pennsylvania statewide class pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23. The Class Period is based on 2 groups: Group 1 is any time in the four-year period prior to 10-8-2013, and Group 2 is from 10-8-2010 to 6-8-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Shanon J. Carson****Sarah R. Schalman-Begen****Alexandra Koropey** **Berger & Montague, P.C.****1622 Locust Street****Philadelphia, PA 19103** |
| **6-8-2015** | **08-MD-1961** | **(D. Md.)** | **In re: Municipal Mortgage & Equity, LLC (“MuniMae”)**Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and on behalf of investors who purchased MuniMae stock, allege in their Consolidated and Amended Class Action Complaint (“Complaint”) claims against Defendants arising under §§11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 (the “Securities Act”) and §§10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) for issuing materially false and misleading statements and omissions concerning MuniMae’s compliance with accounting standards. With regard to the Securities Act claims, the Complaint alleged that Defendants made various materially false and misleading statements and omissions in the Company’s prospectus and registration documents accompanying its February 2, 2005 Secondary Public Offering (“SPO”). The Class Period is from 5-3-2004 to 1-29-2008. | **9-24-2015** | **For more information write to:**David BrowerBrower Piven A Professional Corporation475 Park Avenue South 33rd Floor,New York, New York 10016 |
| **6-11-2015** | **13-CV-02115** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **In re: Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Corporation Securities Litigation**Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges violations of Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder. Plaintiff alleges that Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Corp., (“GLDD”) and certain of its officers and directors, made false and/or misleading statements and/or failed to disclose, among other things: (i) that the Company was booking change orders as revenue when, in actuality, those orders were pending and client approval for the cost increases included therein was not finalized and, in many cases, was not forthcoming; (ii) that such revenue recognition practices within GLDD’s demolition segment were improper and misleading; (iii) that the Company’s financial statements during the Class Period did not provide a fair presentation of the Company’s finances and operations, including GLDD’s overstated revenue; (iv) that, as a result, the Company’s financial results were not prepared in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (“GAAP”); (v) that the Company lacked adequate internal and financial controls; and (vi) that, as a result of the above, the Company’s financial statements were materially false and misleading at all relevant times. The Class Period is from 8-7-2012 to 8-7-2013. | **9-18-2015** | **For more information call or visit:****Claims Administrator****866 329-5543 (Ph.)**[**www.gldredgesettlement.com**](http://www.gldredgesettlement.com) |
| **6-11-2015** | **13-CV-1165** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **Guam Retirement Fund v. Invacare Corporation, et al.**Securities-purchase-plaintiff alleged under Section 10(b) of the Securities exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, and under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act, that the Settling Defendants made materially false and misleading statements and omissions concerning Invacare’s regulatory compliance. The Complaint further alleged that the prices of Invacare publicly traded common stock were artificially inflated as a result of the Settling Defendants’ allegedly false and misleading statements and omissions. The Class Period is from 2-27-2009 to 12-7-2011. | **9-24-2015** | **For more information write to:****Bernstein Litowitz Berger** **& Grossmann LLP****Blair A. Nicholas****Niki L. Mendoza****12481 High Bluff Drive, Suite 300****San Diego, CA 92130** |
| **6-12-2015** | **07-CV-4735** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Joe Santo, et al. v. Laborers’ International Union of NA (aka “LIUNA”)** Union member-plaintiffs allege that in July 2006, while Locals 1010 and 1018 were under trusteeship, the Defendants unilaterally increased the working dues of the members of both Local Unions. The working dues were increased from $.75 per straight time hour paid, $1.12 per one-and-a-half-time hour paid, and $1.50 per double-time hour paid to 4.5 percent of all straight-time wages paid. The U.S. District Court found in a Memorandum and Order dated 12-19-2011, that this dues increase violated federally guaranteed rights under Title I of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (“LMRDA”). This Settlement concerns the dues increase asserted under the LMRDA. The Class Period is from 7-1-2006 to 2-23-2012. | **11-12-2015** | **For more information write or call:****Rust Consulting, Inc.****Santo v. LIUNA, et al.****c/o Rust Consulting, Inc.****4714 PO Box 2396****Faribault, MN 55021-9096****888 812-1642 (Ph.)** |
| **6-12-2015** | **11-CV-3600** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Crude Oil Commodity Futures Litigation**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that the Defendants manipulated the prices of New York Mercantile Exchange (“NYMEX”) and Intercontinental Exchanges (“ICE”) West Texas Intermediate (“WTI”) crude oil futures contracts (and option contracts on such futures contracts) in violation of the Commodity Exchange Act (“CEA”) and monopolized the market for certain WTI crude oil in violation of the Sherman Act. They allegedly did so by multiple steps. These steps include allegedly establishing dominant positions in the WTI crude oil forward market and selling large amounts of WTI crude oil in the forward market on the last day of the “cash window” in January, March and April 2009. The Plaintiffs contend that the foregoing conduct caused them and others similarly situated to pay artificial prices for NYMEX and/or ICE WTI futures contracts and option contracts on such futures contracts. The Class Period is from 1-1-2008 to 5-15-2008. | **10-9-2015** | **For more information write or e-mail:****Christopher McGrath****Lovell Stewart Halebian** **Jacobson LLP****61 Broadway Suite 501****New York, NY, 10006****cmcgrath@lshllp.com****Warren T. Burns****Burns Charest LLP****500 North Akard****Suite 2810****Dallas, TX 75201****wburns@burnscharest.com** |
| **6-12-2015** | **14-CV-01437** | **(E.D. Cal.)** | **Kirchner v. Shred-it USA Inc., et al.**Applicant-plaintiff alleges that Shred-it violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act by procuring or causing to be procured background checks on employees and job applicants without providing a “stand alone” disclosure informing them that a background check would be procured. The Class Period is from 6-16-2009 to 6-16-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Peter R. Dion-Kindem****THE DION-KINDEM LAW FIRM****21550 Oxnard Street****Suite 900****Woodland Hills, California 91367****818 883-4900 (Ph.)** |
| **6-12-2015** | **12-CV-04391** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Johnny Boyd, et al. v. Avanquest North America Inc.**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Avanquest deceptively advertised and sold System Suite as capable of enhancing a personal computer’s speed, performance, and security by detecting and repairing harmful errors, threats and viruses, but that it does not and cannot perform all of the functions advertised. The Class is described as all who purchased Versions 6-12 of Avanquest’s System Suite. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call:****Settlement Administrator****1-844-831-1847** |
| **6-12-2015** | **13-CV-61747** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Soto v. The Gallup Organization, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Gallup Organization, Inc. violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act by using an automatic telephone dialing system to call cellphones without the prior express consent of the recipients. The Class Period is from 8-16-2009 to 8-16-2013.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information call or visit:****1 866 287-7513 (Ph.)**[**http://www.SotoTCPASettlement.com**](http://www.SotoTCPASettlement.com) |
| **6-15-2015** | **12-MD-2316** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **In re: Ford Motor Co. Spark Plug and Three Valve Engine Products Liability Litigation**Purchaser-plaintiff alleges that the spark plugs become stuck and sometimes break in the engine, making them more difficult and expensive to remove. The Class is described as all current or former owners or lessees of certain 2004-2008 Ford vehicles with 5.4 liter 3-valve engines.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information call:****Settlement Administrator****1 844 831-1847 (Ph.)** |
| **6-17-2015** | **12-CV-1817** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Thomas Laumann, Robert Silver, Garrett Traub, and David Dillon v. National Hockey League (“NHL”), et al.**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated federal law by agreeing to allocate the country into exclusive territories in which certain teams would have the exclusive right to broadcast hockey games. Plaintiffs claim that this caused inflated prices for live hockey broadcasts and limited consumer options for viewing NHL hockey broadcasts. The Class Period is from 3-12-2008 to 6-10-2015. | **8-31-2015** | **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** |
| **6-18-2015** | **11-CV-0804** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: China MediaExpress Holdings, Inc. Shareholder Litigation**Purchaser-plaintiff alleges violations under Sections 10(b) (and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder), and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b) and 78t(a)) on behalf of purchasers of China MediaExpress Holding, Inc. (“CCME”) common stock. The Complaint alleges that defendant Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu (Hong Kong Partnership) (“DTT”) violated the above-referenced securities laws by making material false or misleading statements or omissions in its audit opinion on CCME’s 2009 financial statements, which was included in CCME’s 2009 annual report on Form 10-K filed on 3-31-2010. Specifically, the Complaint alleges that DTT falsely represented that DTT had performed its audit of CCME’s 2009 financial statements in compliance with applicable standards, and had falsely expressed an opinion that CCME’s financial statements presented fairly, in all material respects, CCME’s financial position as of 12-3-2009, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles (“GAAP”). The Class Representatives further allege that these false statements allowed CCME stock to trade at artificially inflated prices throughout the Class Period. The Class Period is from 4-1-2010 to 3-11-2011. | **9-15-2015** | **For more information write, call or visit:****Christopher O’Hara****Karl P. Barth****HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL** **SHAPIRO, LLP****1918 Eighth Ave.****Suite 3300****Seattle, WA 98101****206 623-7292 (Ph.)****CCMEsettlement@hbsslaw.com** |
| **6-18-2015** | **12-CV-21678** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Katrina Garcia, et al. v. Kashi Company**Consumer-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendant made false marketing statements that certain food products were “All Natural” or “100% Natural” or “Nothing Artificial” when the products contained one or more genetically modified organisms (“GMO”) or allegedly synthetic ingredients. The Class Period is from 5-3-2008 to [date of preliminary approval]. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Mark A. Milstein****Gillian L. Wade****Sara D. Avila****MILSTEIN ADELMAN LLP****2800 Donald Douglas** **Loop North****Santa Monica, CA 90405****310 396-9600 (Ph.)****310 396-9635 (Fax)****mmilstein@milsteinadelman.com****gwade@milsteinadelman.com****savila@milsteinadelman.com** |
| **6-18-2015** | **11-CV-01802** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Hightower, et al. v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., et al.**Employee-plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”) and similar state laws. Defendants failed to properly compensate nonexempt branch employees (Tellers, Personal Bankers, SSAs, and ABM-Trainees) for all time worked, including overtime. The Lawsuit also alleges that employees in California and New York did not receive reimbursements under state law for purchasing Chase-branded apparel. For employees in California, Kentucky, and Washington, the Lawsuit alleges that Chase did not provide proper meal and rest breaks under applicable state law. Finally, the Lawsuit alleges that employees in California did not receive payment for accrued vacation at termination, did not timely receive their final wages, and did not receive accurate and itemized wage statements.The Class Period for California is from 9-25-2008 to 2-3-2015; for New York from 7-20-2005 to 2-3-2015 and for Arizona, Florida, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Ohio, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin from 2-17-2008 to 2-3-2015.  | **8-3-2015** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Marcus J.Bradley****Marlin & Saltzman LLP****29229 Canwood Street****Suite 208****Agoura Hills, CA. 91301****818 991-8080 (Ph.)****mbradley@marlinsaltzman.com** |
| **6-19-2015** | **12-CV-06003** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Hewlett-Packard Company (“HP”) Shareholder Derivative Litigation** Investor-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that the price of HP’s publicly traded common stock was artificially inflated during the Settlement Class Period as a result of alleged false and misleading statements concerning HP’s acquisition of Autonomy Corporation PLC (“Autonomy”), including statements regardingAutonomy’s value and the reasons for Autonomy’s poor performance after its acquisition. The proposed Settlement, if approved by the Court, will settle claims of all persons who purchased or otherwise acquired HP’s publicly traded common stock. The Class Period is from 8-19-2011 to 11-20-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.HPSecuritiesLitigationSettlement.com**](http://www.HPSecuritiesLitigationSettlement.com) |
| **6-19-2015** | **14-CV-00514** | **(E.D. Cal.)** | **Aimee Lambert v. Buth-Na-Bodhaige, Inc., et al.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Buth-Na-Bodhaige, Inc. d/b/a The Body Shop (“The Body Shop”) and Raze Media, LLC violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act by using an automatic telephone dialing system to send unsolicited text messages to cell phones without prior consent. The Class Period is from 2-20-2010 to 2-20-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Nicholas C. Hornberger****Hornberger Law**  **Corporation****633 W. Fifth Street****28th Floor****Los Angeles, CA 90071** |
| **6-19-2015** | **13-CV-04303** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Paul Perkis, et al. v. LinkedIn Corporation**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that LinkedIn improperly used the Add Connections service to grow its member base. Add Connections allows new and existing LinkedIn members to import contact information from their own external email accounts and invite one or more of those contacts to connect with them on LinkedIn. According to the Plaintiffs,LinkedIn improperly grew its member base through Add Connections by using member names and likenesses to promote its services after receiving this contact information from members.Based on those allegations, the Plaintiffs asserted violations of: (1) California’s common law right of publicity; (2) California’s Unfair Competition Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.) (“UCL”); (3) the Stored Communications Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2701, et seq.; (4) the federal Wiretap Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510, et seq.; (5) California Penal Code § 502; and (6) the California Invasion of Privacy Act, Cal. Penal Code §§ 630, et seq. The Class Period is from 9-17-2011 to 10-31-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Larry C. Russ****Russ August & Kabat****12424 Wilshire Boulevard****12th Floor****Los Angeles, CA 90025** |
| **6-22-2015** | **07-MD-5944** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: CRT Antitrust Litigation (Thomson SA (n/k/a “Technicolor SA”) and Thomson Consumer Electronics, Inc. (n/k/a “Technicolor USA, Inc.”), (collectively the “Thomson Defendants”)**See CAFA Notices dated 6-5-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.crtsettlement.com**](http://www.crtsettlement.com) |
| **6-25-2015** | **10-MD-02196****11-CV-00166****11-CV-00349****11-pf-10010****Original case numbers** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **In re: Polyurethane Form Antitrust Litigation****Susan Gomez v. Hickory Springs Mfg.** **Henry Johs v. Hickory Springs Mfg. Co.****Greg Beastrom v. Carpenter Co. [on behalf of Carpenter Co.]**Indirect-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that the Defendants engaged in a conspiracy to increase prices of polyurethane foam, which is used in carpet cushion, bedding products (like mattresses and pillows), and upholstered furniture, and to allocate customers. Plaintiffs contend that Defendants’ actions violated antitrust and consumer protection laws in numerous states. The Class Period is from 1-1-1999 to present. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.PolyFoamClassAction.com**](http://www.PolyFoamClassAction.com) |
| **6-25-2015** | **14-CV-3235** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **In re Canon Inkjet Printer Litigation**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege various legal claims against Canon USA on behalf of themselves, and on behalf of other consumers who had purchased the Printers, based upon the alleged existence of a Print Head Issue involving the Printers. These lawsuits were consolidated into a single action. The Class Members include all persons who purchased either (1) in new condition from either Canon USA or one of its authorized Printer resellers, or (2) in refurbished condition directly from Canon USA, one or more of the following models of Canon-brand PIXMA inkjet printers: iP360, iP4700, iP4820, iP4920, iX6520, iX7000, MG5120, MG5220, MG5320, MG6120, MG6220, MG8120, MG8220, MP500, MP530, MP560, MP600, MP610, MP620, MP640, MP730, MP800, MP960, MP970, MP990, MX700, MX712, MX850, MX860, MX870, MX882, MX892, MX7600, PRO9000MKII and PRO9500MKII. | **11-2-2015** | **For more information write to:****William B. Federman****Federman & Sherwood****10205 N. Penn., Ave.****Oklahoma City, OK 73120****Benjamn F. Johns****Chimicles & Tikellis LLP****One Haverford Centre****361 West Lancaster Avenue****Haverford, PA 19041** |
| **6-26-2015** | **10-MD-02196****10-CV-02089****10-MD-2196****10-MD-2196****10-MD-2196****Original case numbers** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **In re: Polyurethane Foam Antitrust Litigation****Vicky’s Furniture v. Hickory Springs Manufacturing Co., et al.****Gomez v. Hickory Springs Mfg., Co., et al.****Hudson, et al. v. Hickory Springs Mfg., Co., et al.** **Beastrom, et al. v. Carpenter Company, et al.****[on behalf of Mohawk Industries, Inc.]**See CAFA Notice dated 6-25-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.PolyFoamClassAction.com**](http://www.PolyFoamClassAction.com) |
| **6-26-2015** | **10-MD-02196****10-CV-02089****10-MD-2196****10-MD-2196****10-MD-2196****Original case numbers** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **In re: Polyurethane Foam Antitrust Litigation****Vicky’s Furniture v. Hickory Springs Manufacturing Co., et al.****Gomez v. Hickory Springs Mfg., Co., et al.****Hudson, et al. v. Hickory Springs Mfg., Co., et al.** **Beastrom, et al. v. Carpenter Company, et al.****[on behalf of Woodbridge Foam Corporation, Woodbridge Foam Fabricating, Inc., and Woodbridge Sales and Engineering, Inc. (collectively, “Woodbridge”)]**See CAFA Notice dated 6-25-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.PolyFoamClassAction.com**](http://www.PolyFoamClassAction.com) |
| **6-26-2015** | **12-CV-03001** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Nick Cancilla, Greg Jewell, David Deausoleil, Patrick Sweeney, Lucio Flores, Thomas Jennison, Michael Emanuel, Robert Birch, Kenneth Forbes, Brian O’Neil and Frederick Simon v. Ecolab, Inc.**Employee-plaintiffs allege that Ecolab misclassified Service Specialists as exempt from overtime, and improperly failed to pay overtime to Service Specialists. Plaintiffs allege that by classifying Service Specialists as exempt from overtime, Ecolab violated the federal Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”), and the wage and hour laws of Colorado, Illinois, Maryland, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Washington. The Class Period is from 6-12-2009 to 4-30-2015.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:****Altshuler Berzon LLP****James M. Finberg****Eve H. Cer Vantex****Connie K. Chan****177 Post Street****Suite 300****San Francisco, CA 94108****jfinberg@altshulerberzon.com****ecrevantez@altshulerberzon.com****cchan@altshulerberzon.com** |
| **6-29-2015** | **14-CV-01921** | **(E.D. Cal.)** | **Heidi Anderson-Butler and Paula Haug, et al. v. Charming Charlie Inc., et al.**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Charming Charlie requested and recorded its customers’ personal identification information (such as an address or telephone number) as part of transactions involving the purchase of merchandise when the customer paid with a credit card. The lawsuit further alleges that this practice took place at Charming Charlie’s California stores and violated a California law.The Class Period is from 7-9-2013 to [the date of entry of the Preliminary Approval Order]. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****James M. Lindsay, Esq.****Lindsay Law Corporation****21 Natoma Street****Suite 160** **Folsom, CA 95630** |
| **6-29-2015** | **11-CV-03658** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Longtop Financial Technologies Limited Securities Litigation**Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that Defendants made material misrepresentations and omissions regarding Longtop’s business operations, financial well-being and future prospects, and/or controlled defendants who made such statements, and that as the true facts regarding Longtop’s financial conditions and prospectus became known, and/or the risks concealed by defendants materialized, the price of Longtop American Depositary Shares declined in value, causing damage to Lead Plaintiffs and other putative class members. The Class Period is from 2-21-2008 to 5-17-2011.  | **10-13-2015** | **For more information write:****Gregory M. Castaldo****Kimberly A. Justice****Kessler Topaz** **Meltzer & Check, LLP****280 King of Prussia Road****Radnor, PA 19087** |
| **6-29-2015** | **10-MD-02196****10-CV-02089****11-CV-00166****11-CV-00349****11-CV-01055****11-PF-10010** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **In re: Polyurethane Foam Antitrust Litigation** **Leggett & Platt, Incorporated** **Vicky’s Furniture, Inc. v. Hickory Springs Mfg. Co., et al. Gomez v. Hickory Springs Mfg., Co., et al.****Henry Johs v. Hickory Springs Mfg., Co.****Beastrom, et al. v. The Carpenter Co., et al.****[on behalf of Hickory Springs Manufacturing Company (“Hickory Springs”)]**See CAFA Notice dated 6-25-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.PolyFoamClassAction.com**](http://www.PolyFoamClassAction.com) |