Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
11-4-2014	13-CV-00116	(N.D. Ill.)	In re: National Collegiate Athletic Association Student-Athlete Concussion Injury Litigation Student-player-plaintiff alleges that the NCAA was negligent and breached its duty to protect all current and former student-athletes by failing to adopt appropriate rules regarding concussions and/or manage the risk from concussions. The named plaintiffs sought medical monitoring for all current and former student-athletes, as well as changes to the NCAA's return-to-play guidelines for student- athletes who had suffered concussions or concussion symptoms. Subsequently, 12 additional class action lawsuits were filed on behalf of current and former NCAA football players, seeking medical monitoring and the establishment of guidelines regarding how NCAA schools handle concussions. The Class Members are all persons who played an NCAA-sanctioned sport at an NCAA member institution at any time through the Date of Preliminary Approval.	Not set yet	For more information write to: Steve W. Berman Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP 1918 Eighth Avenue Suite 3300 Seattle, Washington 98101 Joseph J. Siprut Siprut PC 17 North State Street Suite 1600 Chicago, Illinois 60602
11-7-2014	13-CV-02488	(C.D. Cal.)	Dana Bostick, et al. v. Herbalife International of America, Inc., et al. Distributor-plaintiffs allege that Herbalife operated a pyramid scheme contrary to California state law. The plaintiffs also allege that Herbalife's promotional materials made misleading claims regarding certain business opportunities. The Class Period is from 4-1-2009 through the Date of Preliminary Approval.	Not set yet	For more information write to: Fabian & Clendenin, P.C. 215 South State Street Suite 1200 Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 Foley Bezek Behle & Curtis, LLP 14 W. Carrillo Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
11-7-2014	04-MDL-1629	(D. Mass.)	Harden Manufacturing Corp., et al. v. Pfizer Inc., et al. For more information see CAFA Notice dated 6- 3-2014. The class action settlement was filed on 5-30-2014. The Final Order and Judgment Granting Final Approval of the Settlement Agreement was filed on 11-7-2014.	10-23-2014	For more information visit: 1 855 793-1372 (Ph.) www.NeurontinSettleme nt.com
11-7-2014	13-CV-0485	(S.D. Cal.)	Jeannette Clark v. LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc. Consumer-plaintiff alleges that certain LG Signature Model Refrigerators contain a defect with the ice fan that is evidenced by at least one of the following objective indicators: an IF error code in the control panel; low or no ice production; clogged ice systems, water leaking; the refrigerator shutting off on its own; loud motor sounds; or ticking and grinding that goes away when the refrigerator is shut off. The class includes all Purchasers before 1-29-2014.	Not set yet	For more information write to: Callahan, Thompson, Sherman & Caudill, LLP Kathleen M. Hartman 2601 Main Street Suite 800 Irvine, CA 92614
11-7-2014	06-CV-02163	(D.N.J.)	Ralph Demmick, et al. v. Cellco Partnership, et al. (a/k/a Verizon Wireless) Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Verizon Wireless improperly billed Family SharePlan customers whose plans provided for different per-minute rates for "after-allowance" minutes used by different phone lines, in violation of customer contracts and state and federal laws. The lawsuit also claims that Verizon Wireless improperly charged Family SharePlan customers for "In-Network" or "In-Family" calling when	Not set yet	For more information write to: Robert A. Curtis Foley Bezek Behle & Curtis, LLP 15 West Carrillo Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			these calls should have been free under the customers' plans. The Class Period is from 5- 11-2002 to 5-10-2006.		
11-10-2014	11-CV-30235	(D. Mass.)	Golden Star, Inc. v. Massachusetts Mutual Life Ins. Co. Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that MassMutual breached fiduciary duties under ERISA and engaged in prohibited transactions under ERISA by contracting with mutual fund companies to receive "Revenue Sharing" payments. The class period is from 10-19-2011 to Date of Preliminary Approval.	Not set yet	For more information write to: James E. Miller Shepherd, Finkelman, Miller & Shah, LLP 65 Main Street Chester, CT 06412
11-13-2014	10-MD-02196	(N.D. Ohio)	<pre>In re: Polyurethane Foam Antitrust Litigation, on behalf of Leggett & Platt, Incorporated Direct-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendants conspired to fix, raise, stabilize, or maintain the prices of Flexible Polyurethane Foam, in violation of antitrust laws. As used herein, Flexible Polyurethane Foam includes both "slabstock" flexible polyurethane foam (also known as "block" foam) and carpet underlay (also known as "carpet cushion," "carpet pad" or "carpet padding") manufactured from polyurethane foam, but does not include "molded" foam (also known as "engineered" foam) or "rigid" foam (also known as "technical" foam). Flexible Polyurethane Foam includes "fabricated" products made from these types of foam. The Class Period is from 1-1-1999 to 7-31-2010.</pre>	2-3-2015	For more information call or visit: 1 888 331-9196 (Ph.) www.flexiblepolyurethanefo amsettlement.com

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
2400			Summary of Issue	Date	
11-14-2014	13-CV-5125	(N.D. Cal.)	Davis v. VISA, Inc. Consumer-plaintiff alleges that in providing a benefit to its cardholders covering damages caused to rental cars under certain circumstances, VISA improperly rejected claims made under the Benefit by credit card holders who were involved in accidents while driving Zipcars. VISA, on the other hand, contends that Zipcars were never covered under the Benefit and maintains that it handled all claims properly. The Class Period covers all who, prior to 11-6-2014, made a claim to VISA for such Benefit based on an incident involving a Zipcar (the "Claim"). In addition Defendant shall treat claims involving Zipcars as covered under the benefit through 4-1-2015 and shall not deny any claim submitted under the Benefit solely because the vehicle at issue was a Zipcar.	Not set yet	For more information write or visit: Charles D. Marshall Marshall Law firm 2121 N. California Blvd. Suite 290 Walnut Creek, CA 94596 <u>http://www.marshall-law-firm.com/VISA-Zipcar-Class-Action-Settlement</u>
11-14-2014	11-CV-2448	(S.D.N.Y.)	Raniere, et al. v. Citigroup Inc., et al. Employee-plaintiffs allege that Defendants denied compensation for overtime hours they worked in violation of federal and certain state overtime and other wage and hour laws. Specifically, Named Plaintiffs allege that they were denied overtime compensation by being misclassified as exempt prior to 7-18- 2010, and thereafter were not paid all overtime compensation for work performed off- the-clock. Named Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and the Class Members, seek to recover overtime pay, interest, penalties, and	Not set yet	For more information write or fax: Douglas H. Wigdor David E. Gottlieb Wigdor LLP 85 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10003 212 257-6845 (Fax)

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
			attorney's fees and costs. The Class Period is from 4-8-2005 to 9-15-2013.		
11-14-2014	10-CV-00326	(D. Nev.)	Lee, et al. v. Enterprise Leasing Company - West, LLC, et al. Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Defendants charge a line item on Enterprise contracts, called an "airport concession recovery fee" or "Airport Access fee," that was calculated based on the rental amount for the car (the "Concession Fee"). These Concession Fees typically included an amount that represented 10% (or 11.1% in Reno) of the base rental rate for renting a car from Enterprise. The Court has ruled that Enterprise violated Nevada law by identifying this fee on the base rental rate as a separate line item (rather than including it in the base rental price itself). The Class Period is from 6-3-2004 to 9-30- 2009.	Not set yet	For more information write to: G. David Robertson Robertson, Johnson, Miller & Williamson 50 W. Liberty Street Reno, NV 89501 775 329-5600 (Ph.) 775- 348-8300 (Fax)
11-17-2014	10-CV-00975	(S.D.N.Y.)	In re: CRM Holdings Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege violations of the Federal Securities Laws (specifically Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. §78240 10b-5)(b) and 78(t)(a)) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder (17 C.F.R. §240 10b-5)). CRM served as a third party administrator for eight self- insured workers' compensation trusts in New York State. Plaintiffs allege that CRM's business was dependent upon the trusts being fully funded and operating, as CRM was paid	Not set yet	For more information write to: Lionel Z. Glancy Glancy Binkow & Goldberg LLP 1925 Century Park East Suite 2100 Los Angeles, CA 90067 1 888 773-9224 (Ph.)

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
			administrative fees based on trust membership; that the Defendants misrepresented and or omitted material facts concerning the funding levels of the trusts; and that New York State took regulatory action against CRM as a result. The Class Period is from 12-21-2005 to 11-5-2008, inclusive.		
12-17-2014	13-CV-3999	(N.D. Ill.)	Ramirez v. Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Ocwen sent letters to consumers that threatened to schedule the sale of homes prior to having the legal authority to do so, thereby violating the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, ("FDCPA"), 15 U.S.C. §1692 et al. The Class Period is from 1-1-2013 to 7-31-2013.	3-13-2015	For more information write to: Cassandra P. Miller Edelman, Combs, Latturner & Goldwin, LLC 20 S. Clark Street Suite 1500 Chicago, IL 60603
11-17-2014	12-CV-2865	(S.D.N.Y.)	Policemen's Annuity and Benefit Fund, et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., et al. Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege claims against Bank of America NA ("BANA") as the former trustee, and U.S. Bank as the current trustee, of the Covered Trusts. Plaintiffs allege, among other things: (i) that mortgage files for the mortgage loans owned by the Covered Trusts lacked certain documentation, and that Defendants failed to take appropriate steps to enforce the Covered Trusts' rights to obtain the documentation or to have such mortgage loans repurchased or replaced by the entities (or their successors) that sold the loans to the Covered Trusts; (ii) that mortgage loans owned by the Covered Trusts	3-12-2015	For more information write to: Deborah Clark-Weintraub Max R. Schwartz Scott+Scott Attorneys at Law, LLP The Chrysler Building 405 Lexington Avenue 40 th Floor New York, NY 10174 Julie Goldsmith Reiser Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll PLLC 1100 New York Ave., N.W. Suite 500 Washington, D.C. 20005

Summary of IssueDatebreached representations and warranties made by the entities that sold the loan to the covered Trusts, and that Defendants failed to take appropriate steps to enforce the covered Trusts' rights to have such breaches cured or to have such loans repurchased or replaced by those entities (or their successors); and (iii) that Defendants failed to provide notice to holders of Certificates issued by the Covered Trusts that the servicers of the	Notice O Date	Case Number Cour	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
by the entities that sold the loan to the covered Trusts, and that Defendants failed to take appropriate steps to enforce the covered Trusts' rights to have such breaches cured or to have such loans repurchased or replaced by those entities (or their successors); and (iii) that Defendants failed to provide notice to holders of Certificates issued by the			Summary of Issue	Date	
<pre>bootstating loans allegedly had defaulted on their obligations to take appropriate steps to obtain cures of documentation problems or of breachess of representations and warranties, or to obtain repurchases or replacements of the affected loans. Plaintiffs allege claims for alleged breaches of the contracts that govern the Covered Trusts (called pooling and servicing agreements) and for alleged violations of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939. The Settlement Class: Plaintiffs and every other person and entity that purchased or otherwise acquired any of the Certificates at any time (including but not limited to any beneficial owners), and that (i) sold or otherwise disposed of the Certificates as of 11-7-2014, or (ii) did not sell or otherwise dispose of the Certificates as of 11-7-2014, but suffered an Out-of-Pocket Loss.</pre>			breached representations and warranties made by the entities that sold the loan to the covered Trusts, and that Defendants failed to take appropriate steps to enforce the covered Trusts' rights to have such breaches cured or to have such loans repurchased or replaced by those entities (or their successors); and (iii) that Defendants failed to provide notice to holders of Certificates issued by the Covered Trusts that the servicers of the mortgage loans allegedly had defaulted on their obligations to take appropriate steps to obtain cures of documentation problems or of breaches of representations and warranties, or to obtain repurchases or replacements of the affected loans. Plaintiffs allege claims for alleged breaches of the contracts that govern the Covered Trusts (called pooling and servicing agreements) and for alleged violations of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939. The Settlement Class: Plaintiffs and every other person and entity that purchased or otherwise acquired any of the Certificates at any time (including but not limited to any beneficial owners), and that (i) sold or otherwise disposed of the Certificates as of 11-7-2014, or (ii) did not sell or otherwise dispose of the Certificates as of 11-7-2014,	Date	

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
11-17-2014	13-CV-00081 14-CV-06759	(C.D. Cal.)	Jeffery Etter, et al. v. Thetford Corporation, et al. Charles Chow, et al. v. Thetford Corporation, et al. Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Defendants' Norcold 1200 Series, N8 Series and N6 Series gas absorption refrigerators, typically installed in RV2 (motorhomes, travel trailers, and boats), share a safety related defect in the cooling unit which, in certain circumstances, causes the boiler tubes to corrode and leak flammable gas, exposing owners and other users of the RVs to the risk of fire. The Plaintiffs allege class claims for breach of state consumer protection statutes and for breach of express and implied warranties. The Class Period for the Norcold 1200 Series is from 1-1-2002 to 10-1-2012 and for the Norcold N6 Series is from 1-1-2009 to 12-31-2013.	Not set yet	For more information write to: Hart L. Robinovitch Zimmerman Reed, PLLP 14646 N. Kierland Blvd. Scottsdale, AZ 85254
11-20-2015	14-CV-00943	(N.D. I11.)	<pre>Stephan Zouras LLP v. American Registry LLC Consumer-plaintiff alleges that American Registry violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"). Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that American Registry and/or its affiliates sent faxes to unwilling recipients in an effort to market its products or services. The Settlement Class is defined as: All individuals or entities in the U.S. who, on or before [preliminary approval date], received</pre>	4-13-2015	For more information write to: Joseph J. Siprut Siprut PC 17 North State Street Chicago, Illinois 60602

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue from or on behalf of American Registry LLC or any of its predecessors or affiliated entities or individuals one or more unsolicited facsimile advertisements.	Date	
11-21-2014	10-MD-02196	(N.D. Ohio)	In re: Polyurethane Foam Antitrust Litigation, Notice on behalf of Carpenter Co., E.R. Carpenter, LP and Carpenter Holdings, Inc. (the "Carpenter Defendants"). For more information see 11-13-2014 above.	2-3-2015	For more information call or visit: 1 888 331-9196 (Ph.) www.flexiblepolyurethanefo amsettlement.com
11-21-2014	13-CV-30144	(D. Mass.)	Rich, et al. v. Lowe's Home Center, Inc. Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Lowe's requested and recorded customer ZIP codes (other than for shipping, installation, or delivery purposes) as part of transactions involving the purchase of merchandise when the customer paid with a credit card. It is alleged that this practice took place at Lowe's Massachusetts stores and violated Massachusetts law. The Class Period is from 6-3-2009 to Preliminary Approval Date.	Not set yet	For more information write to: D. Greg Blankinship Finkelstein, Blankinship, Frei-Pearson & Garber, LLP 1311 Mamaroneck Avenue Suite 220 White Plains, NY 10605
11-21-2014	10-CV-08086	(S.D.N.Y.)	GE Dandong, et al. v. Pinnacle Performance Limited, et al. Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendants are in violation of fraud, fraudulent inducement, negligent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, and unjust enrichment in	Not set yet	For more information write to: Daniel Hume Anderson M. McNeela Christopher S. Studebaker Meghan J. Summers Kirby McInerney LLP 825 Third Avenue 16 th Floor

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			connection with defendants' structuring and issuance of the Pinnacle Notes and their Underlying Assets - the Morgan Stanley ACES Collateralized Debt Obligations. The Class Period is from 1-1-2006 to 12-31-2010.		New York, NY 10022
11-24-2014	11-MD-02235	(E.D. Pa.)	In re: Foot Locker, Inc., Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and Wage and Hour Litigation Hill, et al. v. Foot Locker, Inc., et al., Jointly referred to as Foot Locker Wage and Hour Settlement Employee-plaintiffs allege that Foot Locker failed to pay them, and other similarly situated hourly retail employees, including but not limited to employees with the job titles of sales associate, sales clerk, stock person and/or cashier (collectively "Illinois Retail Employees"): (i) the minimum wage for all hours worked; (ii) overtime wages at the rate of one and one-half times the employee's regular rate for all hours worked in excess of 40 hours in any given workweek; and (iii) all wages, including overtime pay, within the required pay period. The Class Period is between 3-2-2007 and 3-2-1010 for one class of employees and between 10-17-2005 and 5-13-2011 for a second class of employees.	Not set yet	For more information write or call: Peter A. Muhic James Maro Monique Myatt Galloway Kessler Topaz Meltzer & Check, LLP 280 King of Prussia Road Radnor, PA 19087 610 667-7706 (Ph.) Judith P. Broach Amy F. Shulman Broach & Stulberg, LLP One Penn Plaza Suite 2016 New York, NY 10119 212 268-1000 (Ph.)
11-25-2014	11-CV-4462	(N.D. I11.)	Craftwood Lumber Company v. Interline Brands, Inc. (DE) and Interline Brands, Inc. (NJ) Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Interline violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, ("TCPA") by sending via facsimile	Not set yet	For more information write to: Law Offices of Scott Z. Zimmermann Scott Z. Zimmermann

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue transmission, unsolicited advertisements and advertisements that do not comply with the TCPA's opt-out notice requirements. The Faxes promoted products sold by the following Interline brands: Hardware Express, Barnett Pro, Barnett Wholesale, Barnett Export, Leran, All Fit, U.S. Lock, Maintenance USA, Sexauer, Wilmar and Sunstar. The Class Period is from 5-10-2010 to 7-4-2011.	Date	601 S. Figueroa Street Suite 2610 Los Angeles, CA 90017 Payne & Fears LLP C. Darryl Cordero 801 S. Figueroa Street Suite 1150 Los Angeles, CA 90017
11-25-2014	13-cv-00035	(C.D. Cal.)	Couser v. Apria Healthcare, Inc. Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Apria placed calls made through the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or artificial prerecorded voice calls to cellular telephones in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b) (1). The Class Period is from 1-9-2010 to 5-31- 2014.	Not set yet	For more information call: Kazerouni Law Group, APC 800 400-6808 (Ph.)
11-25-2014	13-CV-07945	(N.D. I11.)	Lambert v. Tellabs, Inc., et al. Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that the members of the Tellabs board of directors breached their fiduciary duties to Tellabs shareholders in connection with Tellabs' sales process and the Merger, including by allegedly failing to undertake an adequate sales process, obtaining an unfair and inadequate price, engaging in self-dealing, including various "deal protection devices," and failing to disclose to the company's shareholders information necessary to make an informed decision with respect to the Merger. The	Not set yet	For more information write to: Juan E. Monteverde Faruqi & Faruqi LLP 369 Lexington Avenue 10 th Floor New York, NY 10003

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue lawsuit also claims that the Schedule 14D-9 filed by Tellabs in connection with the Merger contained misleading or otherwise inadequate disclosures in violation of certain federal securities laws and alleged state law fiduciary duties. Tellabs, Marlin, and Marlin's Affiliates are claimed to have aided and abetted these alleged legal violations. The Class Period is from 10-18-2013 to 12-2- 2013.	Date	
11-25-2014	13-CV-8166	(C.D. Cal.)	Jonsson v. USCB, Inc. Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Defendant USCB, Inc., violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. § 227, the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692 et seq., and the California Rosenthal Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1788 et seq., by making calls to cell phones using an automatic telephone dialing system ("autodialer") or an artificial or prerecorded voice. This may have included calls to cell phone numbers that did not belong to the person from whom USCB was seeking to collect a debt i.e., "wrong number" calls. The Class Period is from 11-5-2009 to 5-15-2014.	Not set yet	For more information write to: Lance Raphael and Stacy Bardo Consumer Advocacy Center, P.C. 180 West Washington St. Suite 700 Chicago, IL 60602 Marovitch Law Firm, LLC Dan Marovitch 233 South Wacker Drive 84 th Floor Chicago, IL 60606
11-25-2014	13-CV-8654	(N.D. Ill.)	Manisha Krishnan, Lynn Fritzler Dominick, Raymond Fritzler, and Brian Russo v. Autovest, LLC. Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Autovest violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, the Illinois Collection Agency Act and	3-18-2015	For more information write to: Thomas E. Soule Edelman Combs Latturner & Goodwin LLC 20 South Clark Street

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act, by suing after applicable statutes of limitations had expired. The Class Period is from 12-3-2010 to 12-23-2013.	Date	Suite 1500 Chicago IL 60603
11-25-2014	12-CV-06518	(S.D.N.Y.)	Fraticelli v. Madison Square Garden Company and MSG Holdings, L.P., et al. Intern-plaintiffs assert claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") and New York law that MSG failed to properly compensate Interns by misclassifying them as non-employees, and failing to pay them sufficiently for all hours spent interning, including overtime. The Class Period is from 9-5-2011 to the date of the Preliminary Approval Order.	Not set yet	For more information write or call: Virginia & Ambinder, LLP 40 Broad Street 7 th Floor New York, N.Y. 10004 212 943-9080 Leeds Brown Law, P.C. One Old Country Road Carle Place, N.Y. 11514 516 873-9550
11-25-2014	11-MD-02220	(N.D. Ohio)	In re: Kaba Simplex Locks Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that the Defendants improperly designed the specified models (below) of mechanical pushbutton locks; as a result, the locks are vulnerable to intentional malicious magnetic manipulation. The first subclass consists of all non- governmental individuals and entities in the U.S. who used or owned, and the second subclass consists of all locksmiths in the U.S. who purchased for resale, a Simplex or Unican Model/Series 1000, L 1000, 2000, 3000, 6200, 7000, 7100, 8000 or File Guard mechanical pushbutton lock manufactured before	Not set yet	For more information write to: Class Action Administration, Inc. 6521 West 91 st Avenue Westminster, CO 80031 720 540-4422 (Ph.)

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			1-1-2011 or purchased before it was upgraded to deter magnetic manipulation.		
11-26-2014	08-CV-00868	(N.D. Cal.)	Felton A. Spears, Jr., et al. v. First American eAppraiseIT, LLC Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Washington Mutual Bank, F.A.'s ("WMB") and First American eAppraiseIT ("EA") had an unlawful agreement wherein EA, in return for WMB's appraisal business, agreed to provide WMB property appraisals and to improperly inflate home values when WMB needed EA to inflate them, so WMB could make home loans on the terms WMB wanted. EA charged WMB a fee for each appraisal. WMB often passed this fee on to the Settlement Class Members. The Class Period is on or after 6-1-2006.	Not set yet	For more information write, call or fax: Joseph N. Kravec, Jr. Feinstein Doyle Payne & Kravec, LLC 429 Forbes Avenue Allegheny Building 17 th Floor Pittsburgh, PA 15219 888 355-1735 (Ph.) 412 281-1007 (Fax)
11-26-2014	12-MD-02328	(E.D. La.)	In re Pool Products Distribution Market Antitrust Litigation Direct-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that PoolCorp and the Manufacturer Defendants entered into agreements in violation of the antitrust laws and that PoolCorp attempted to monopolize the alleged 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 purchased from PoolCorp than they otherwise would have paid. The Class Period is from 11- 22-2007 to 11-21-2011.	Not set yet	For more information write to: Herman, Herman & Katz LLC 820 O'Keefe Avenue New Orleans, LA 70113 Berstein Liebhard LLP 10 East 40 th Street 22 nd Floor New York, NY 10016

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
11-26-2014	13-CV-00662	(D. Md.)	Jay Clogg Realty Group, Inc. v. Burger King Corporation Fax-recipient-plaintiff alleges that Burger King Corporation violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA") by sending or attempting to send advertisements via facsimile without the consent of the recipients and without including certain opt- out language required by the TCPA. The Class Period is from 3-1-2009 to 11-17-2014.	Not set yet	For more information write to: Edward A. Broderick Anthony I. Paronich Broderick Law, P.C. 125 Summer Street Suite 1030 Boston, MA 02110
11-26-2014	13-CV-07653	(N.D. Ill.)	Dr. William M. Pollack, et al., v. InCrowd, Inc. Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Defendant sent unsolicited facsimile advertisements promoting its goods or services for sale. Plaintiffs further complain that the fax in question did not contain an opt-out notice as required by the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. § 227. Plaintiffs also allege that the sending of these faxes violated the Illinois Consumer Fraud Act and Illinois common law (conversions, private nuisance, and trespass to chattels). Plaintiff has sought to represent a class of persons to whom InCrowd sent the alleged unsolicited advertising facsimiles. The Class Period is from 10-24-2009 to 10-24-2013.	Not set yet	For more information write to: Edelman, Combs, Latturner & Goodwin, LLC 20 S. Clark Street Suite 1500 Chicago, IL 60603