Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
-			Summary of Issue	Date	
10-3-2011	09-CV-00104	(M.D. Ala.)	In re: Colonial Bancgroup, Inc. Securities Litigation Plaintiffs allege violations of the anti-fraud provisions of the securities laws arising from alleged misstatements and omissions made in connection with Colonial's publicly-filed financials and other alleged misstatements made by Colonial's senior officers. The Securities Act claims arise from alleged misstatements and omissions in a subordinated note offering and a stock offering conducted by the company in March and April 2008. Class Members are all persons or entities who purchased: (i) the common stock of Colonial (ii) Colonial's common stock traceable to the company's 4-23-2008 stock offering pursuant to the Registration Statement and Prospectus filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Stock Offering"); and (iii) the \$250 million worth of Subordinated Notes due in 2038, paying 8.875% interest on a quarterly basis, pursuant or traceable to Colonial's Form S-3/A shelf Registration Statement and Prospectus dated 11- 12-2004 and Form 1424 (b)(2) Prospectus Supplement dated 2-28-2008 and 8-6-2009, inclusive, and were allegedly damaged thereby (the "Settlement Class").	Not set yet	No Information
10-3-2011	11-CV-00018	(C.D. Cal.)	Batungbacal v. Power balance LLC, et al. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Power Balance LLC engaged in deceptive and misleading conduct	Not set yet	For more information visit:

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue in the marketing, advertising, selling,	Date	www.pbsettlement.com
			promoting, and distributing of Power Balance products, including Power Balance bracelets, wristbands, pendants, necklaces, and other Power Balance jewelry and holograms (collectively, "Power Balance Products").		
			Class Members are all individuals residing in the United States who purchased one or more Power Balance Products at any time prior to (Date of Preliminary Approval of Settlement), 2011.		
10-4-2011	06-CV-52	(D. Del.)	<pre>In re: Metoprolol Succinate Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation Plaintiffs allege that this unlawful scheme involved: (1) improperly obtaining Patent Nos. 5,001,161 (the "161 Patent") and 5,081,154 (the "154 Patent) through knowing and willful fraud by making false and misleading representations to the Patent and Trademark Office (the "PTO") which, in the absence of the fraud, would not have issued the '161 or '154 Patents; (2) making a sham listing of the '161 and '154 Patents in the "Orange Book", a document maintained by the Food and Drug Administration ("FDA"); and (3) filing and pursuing sham litigation against potential generic competitors. Class Members are all persons or entities in the United States (including, for avoidance of doubt, persons and entities in Puerto Rico) who purchased Toprol-XL directly from any of the</pre>	Not set yet	For more information visit: <u>www.heffler/toproldi</u> <u>rectsettlement.com</u>

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue defendants at any time from 5-5-2005 through 9- 23-2011(the "Class Period"), including persons and entities who have received assignments or partial assignments of rights from direct purchasers of Toprol-XL.	Date	
10-5-2011	11-CV-00166	(W.D.N.Y.)	Anthony Felix & Donnie Jo Harb v. Northstar Location Services, LLC Plaintiffs alleged that Northstar, while attempting to collect debts, used false, deceptive or misleading means in violation of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") and the California Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("RFDCPA"). Class Members are all persons with addresses in the U.S. who received a voice message left by Northstar Location Services, LLC on a telephone answering device or who engaged in a telephone communication with Northstar, wherein the Northstar did not identify itself by its company name as the caller, state the purpose or nature of the communication or disclosed that the communication was from a debt collector, or where Northstar did not disclose at the outset of a communication that the call may be monitored or recorded, or where the Northstar made a false representation or used a deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect any debt or to obtain information concerning a consumer, and where such communication occurred between 2- 28-2010, through (Date of Preliminary Approval of Settlement), 2011.	Not set yet	For more information Contact: Robert L. Arleo 164 Sunset Park Road Haines Falls, NY. 12436 Or call (518) 589-1016

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
10-5-2011	10-CV-467	(D.R.I.)	Baptista v. Mutual of Omaha, et al., Plaintiffs allege that Defendant retained death benefits due under group life insurance policies and invested those benefits for their own account. Plaintiffs claim that this violates the fiduciary standards and prohibited transaction rules found in ERISA - the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974. It is also alleged that Defendants breached their fiduciary duties, individually and in the aggregate, by wrongfully converting the proceeds of approved beneficiary claim amounts owed to the plaintiffs, which are ERISA plan assets, and used them for their own financial gain. Class Members are all beneficiaries of a group life insurance policy obtained through an employer and issued by Mutual of Omaha Insurance	Not set yet	No information
			Company or United of Omaha Life Insurance Company ("Defendants"), and benefits were paid by creation of a Total Access benefits Service Account ("TABS Account"), with a balance in a TABS Account between 11-16-2004 and 6-30-2011.		
10-7-2011	10-CV-00479	(D. Idaho)	Leslie Niederklein, et al., v. PCS Edventures.com, Inc., et al. Plaintiffs allege that PCS and certain of its executives violated the federal securities laws by making false and misleading statements and omissions in connection with the company's announcement of a \$7.15 million contract with PCS Middle East. Class Members suffered damages	Not set yet	For more information write to: Lauren Levi, Shareholder Relations Robbins Umeda LLP 600 B St. Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
			as a result of the decline in the price of PCS's common stock. Class Members are all persons who purchased the common stock of PCS between 3-28-2007 through 8- 15-2007 inclusive.		
10-7-2011	10-CV-2763	(N.D. Cal.)	<pre>Ducharme v. John C. Heath Attorney At Law, PPLC, et al., Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' contracts and policies with consumers for credit repair services improperly restricted the customers' ability to contact credit bureaus directly. This class action asserts claims on behalf of a nationwide class for violations of the Credit Repair Organizations Act. Class Members are current or former clients of defendants in the US and its territories who, between 6-24-2005 and the date on which the court granted preliminary approval of this proposed Settlement Agreement or between such dates entered into a credit repair contract with Heath PLLC or Fullman or any related or affiliated entities or individuals.</pre>	Not set yet	For more information Call: Class counsel at (866)354-3015 Class Counsel: Jay Edelson Steven L. Woodrow Rafey Balabanian Edelson McGuire, LLC 350 North LaSalle, Suite 1300 Chicago, IL 60654
10-7-2011	10-CV-11977	(D. Mass)	In re: Reebok EasyTone Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Reebok, in connection with the marketing and sale of eligible Shoes and Eligible Apparel, misrepresented the benefits of wearing Eligible Shoes and eligible Apparel to consumers. Plaintiffs further allege	Not set yet	For more information visit: www.reeboksettlement .com

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue that Eligible Shoes and eligible Apparel did not provide the benefits to consumers claimed by Reebok. Class Members are all persons or entities that purchased eligible Shoes and/or Eligible Apparel from Reebok and/or its authorized retailers and wholesalers, including, without limitation, Reebok U.S. Retailers, Reebok Concept Stores, Reebok.com and Reebok Outlets and/or other	Date	or www.ftc.gov/reebok
			third-party retailers or wholesalers, from 12-5- 2008, up to and including (Date of Preliminary Approval of Settlement).		
10-7-2011	09-CV-2057	(N.D. Ill.)	<pre>CE Design Ltd. V. King Supply Co. Plaintiffs allege that defendant violated the Federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act, (the "TCPA"), the Illinois Consumer Fraud Act and the common law of conversion by sending advertisements to the class by fax without their prior express invitation or permission. Class Members are all persons who were sent any telephone facsimile message during the period 1- 1-2009 to 5-31-2009 from King Architectural Metals but who did not directly request that King Architectural Metals send the specific facsimile they received.</pre>	1-13-2012	For more information Write to: Phillip A. Bock Bock & Hatch, LLC 134 n. LaSalle St., Suite 1000 Chicago, IL 60602 Or call (312) 658-5501
10-12-2011	10-CV-751	(N.D. Ill.)	O'Hara v. Medieval Times USA, Inc., Plaintiffs alleged that Defendant violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act when persons who used	Not set yet	For more information Call:

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			<pre>Summary of Issue either a credit card or debit card at any of defendant's Castles were provided an electronically-printed receipt at the point of sales or transaction that displayed the expiration date or more than the last five digits of that person's credit card or debit card, during the time period beginning on 6-4- 2008 and ending on 2-3-2010. Plaintiffs alleged that Defendant's conduct did not comport with the Fair Credit Reporting Act's truncation requirement that no more than the last five digits of the account number are to be printed or that no expiration dates are to be printed on the credit or debit card receipts.</pre>	Date	Curtis C. Warner Warner Law Firm, LLC (866) 588-8072 Or e-mail <u>cwarner@warnerlawllc</u> .COM
10-12-2011	09-CV-01899	(D. Conn.)	Todd Fisher and Scott Brewer v. Mitsubishi Digital Electronics America, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that the Televisions contained defects that led to premature product failures.	Not set yet	For more information Write to: Class Counsel
			Class Members are all end user consumers in the United States who purchased or received a Television as a gift.		Thomas P. Sobran 7 Evergreen Lane Hingham, MA 02043

Notice	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness	Website Link
Date			Summary of Issue	Hearing Date	
10-13-2011	09-CV-00139	(N.D. W.V.)	Cather, et al. v. Seneca-Upshur, et al. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants or their predecessors made improper deductions in calculating royalties under the leases and did not calculate royalties based on the fair value of the gas produced.	Not set yet	For more information Visit: <u>www.SenecaSettlement</u> .com
			Class Members: If you owned a royalty interest, for a gas-producing well located in West Virginia, on 12-4-2010, due to a lease with Seneca-Upshur or a lease assigned to Seneca- Upshur, and; 1) received a royalty payments between 6-1-1999, and 11-4-2010, from Seneca- Upshur, or 2) receive any royalty payments from wells previously owned by Forest's predecessor, The Houston Exploration Company, and/or Enervest, whose wells were sold or transferred to Seneca-Upshur between 6-1-1999, and 11-4-2010 and 3) royalty payments were based on money received from the sale of gas produced from a West Virginia well.		
10-13-2011	07-CV-10617	(S.D. N.Y.)	In re Focus Media Holding Limited Litigation Plaintiffs allege that throughout the Class Period, defendants failed to disclose material adverse facts about the Company's financial well-being, business relationships, and prospects. Specifically, defendants failed to disclose or indicate the following: (1) that the company had made numerous acquisitions in its Internet Advertising Business segment; (2) that these acquisitions had significantly reduced	Not set yet	No information

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue gross margins in the Company's Internet Advertising Business segment; and (3) that these acquisitions had substantially increased the Company's operating expenses. Class Members are all persons who purchased or acquired Focus Media Holding Limited ("Focus Media") American Depositary Shares ("ADS") or American Depositary Receipts ("ADR") during the period 9-27-2007 through 11-19-2007, inclusive, and including, without limitation, Focus Media's 11-2007 secondary public offering.	Date	
10-13-2011	10-CV-2257	(N.D. Cal.)	Nguyen v. BMW of North America, LLC Plaintiffs allege that BMW of North America, LLC ("BMWNA" or "BMW NA") became aware of distinct defects in two separate components of the N54 engine: the pressure fuel pump ("HPFP") and the turbocharger wastegates. With respect to the HPFP, Plaintiffs allege that it contains certain defects causing it to fail prematurely. With respect to the turbocharger wastegates, Plaintiffs allege that they contain certain defects resulting in noisy operation and/or "turbo lag." In their complaint, Plaintiffs contend that BMW NA had a duty to disclose this information to consumers. Based on this conduct, Plaintiffs allege claims for Breach of Express Warranty, violation of California's Consumer Legal Remedies Act, violation of California's Unfair Competition Law, breach of the Implied Covenant of good Faith and Fair dealing, and violation of the Federal Magunuson-	Not set yet	For more information Contact: William A. Kershaw Stuart C. Talley Kershaw Cutter & Ratinoff LLP 401 Watt Ave, Sacramento, CA 95864

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness	Website Link
Date			Summary of Issue	Hearing Date	
			Moss Act.		
			Class Members are all persons in the United States who are now or have been at any time owners of record or lessees of any of the following types of vehicles: BMW Model Years 2007-2010 335i models; Model Years 2008-2010 135i, 535i and X6 xDrive35i Sports Activity Coupes; Model Years 2009-2010 Z4 Roadster sDrive35i vehicles.		
10-13-2011	10-CV-37	(C.D. Cal.)	Lockabey, et al. v. American Honda Motor Co.,	3-16-2012	For more information
10 15 2011	10 00 37	(0.2. 001.)	Inc.	5 10 2012	visit:
			Plaintiffs allege that in or around 7-2010, AHM		
			notified owners of model year 2006-2008 Honda Civic Hybrids (HCHs) of a software update to the		www.hchsettlement.com
			Integrated Motor Assist ("IMA") battery system		
			("Software Update"). On 8-18-2010 and 8-20-2010,		
			Plaintiffs Gary Stouch, Branka Krsul, Roy		
			Sherrid, and Ronda Gibble filed lawsuits against AHM on behalf of themselves, a proposed class of		
			model year 2003-2008 HCH owners, and a subclass		
			of model year 2006-2008 HCH owners ("Stouch and		
			Gibble Lawsuits") alleging claims similar to		
			those asserted in the <i>True</i> and <i>Lockabey</i> Lawsuits, and further alleging that the Software		
			Update negatively impacted the fuel economy and		
			performance of their HCHs. In the Lockabey		
			Lawsuit, an Amended Complaint was later filed		
			adding Named Plaintiff Tomas Castrejon and		
			claims on behalf of a subclass of model year 2006-2008 HCH owners and lessees pertaining to		
			the Software Update. The Thieben Lawsuit was		

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
			also later amended to add claims pertaining to the Software Update.		
			Class Members are all persons in the United States and/or the District of Columbia who purchased or leased other than for purposes of resale or distribution a Honda Civic Hybrid model years 2003 through 2009.		
			Class Members Subclass: A Subclass defined as all persons in the United States and/or the District of Columbia who purchased or leased other than for purposes of resale or distribution a Honda Civic Hybrid model year 2006, 2007 or 2008.		
10-13-2011	07-CV-186	(D.N.J.)	Michael H. Kirsch, D.D.S. and Bradford S. Jungels, D.M.D. v. Delta Dental of New Jersey Plaintiffs allege that DDNJ improperly processed claims for dental benefits by "bundling" or	Not set yet	For more information contact Attorney for Class:
			"downcoding" treatment codes, by building of "downcoding" treatment codes, by improperly denying claims for "ancillary services," and by failing to pay claims within statutory "prompt pay" deadlines during the period 2000 to present. The Jungels' Lawsuit also claims that DDNJ engaged in other conduct which resulted in delaying the payment of claims.		Eric D. Katz, Esq. Mazie Slater Katz & Freeman, LLC 103 Eisenhower Parkway Roseland, NJ 07068 Or email ekatz@mskf.net
			Class Members are all dental providers and practices, regardless of specialty or network status, who submitted claims to DDNJ and/or who received claim payment(s) or determinations from DDNJ during the period 11-17-2000 to and through		

Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
		Summary of Issue	Date	
		8-31-2011 for services provided to any person who is or was a subscriber of, or who is or was insured by, DDNJ and/or was entitled to benefits under a plan for which DDNJ processed and/or paid claims for dental services.		
08-CV-04883	(N.D. Ill.)	<pre>In re: Aftermarket Filters Antitrust Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Defendants conspired to illegally fix, raise, maintain, and/or stabilize prices and allocate customers for Light Duty Aftermarket Filters purchased in the U.S., in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act from 3-1-1999 to (Date of Preliminary Approval of Settlement), 2011 causing customers to pay a higher price than they otherwise would have paid in a competitive market for light duty Aftermarket Filters. Class Members are all persons and entities that, from 3-1-1999 to (Date of Preliminary Approval of Settlement), 2011, purchased Light Duty Aftermarket Filters directly from Defendants in the U S</pre>	Not set yet	For more information Contact: Michael J. Freed FEED KANNER LONDON & MILLEN,LLC 2201 Waukegan Rd. Suite 130 Bannockburn, IL. 60015 Telephone: (224)632-4500 Fax: (224)632-4521
10-CV-0198	(W.D. Wash.)	Arthur et. Al v. Sallie Mae, Inc.	Not set vet	For more information go to:
		affiliate or subsidiary of SLM Corporation (including Arrow Financial Services, LLC: Asset Performance Group, LLC; General Revenue	100	www.arthurtcpasettle ment.com
		DE Corporation; SLM Financial Corporation; and Student Assistance Corporation) made automated		or call 1 (888) 730-7196
	08-CV-04883	08-CV-04883 (N.D. Ill.)	Summary of Issue 8-31-2011 for services provided to any person who is or was a subscriber of, or who is or was insured by, DDNJ and/or was entitled to benefits under a plan for which DDNJ processed and/or paid claims for dental services. 08-CV-04883 (N.D. Ill.) In re: Aftermarket Filters Antitrust Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Defendants conspired to illegally fix, raise, maintain, and/or stabilize prices and allocate customers for Light Duty Aftermarket Filters purchased in the U.S., in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act from 3-1-1999 to (Date of Preliminary Approval of Settlement), 2011 causing customers to pay a higher price than they otherwise would have paid in a competitive market for light duty Aftermarket Filters. 10-CV-0198 (W.D. Wash.) Arthur et. Al v. Sallie Mae, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Selie Mae or another affiliate or subsidiary of SLM Corporation (including Arrow Financial Services, LLC: Asset Performance Group, LLC: General Revenue Corporation; SLM Financial Corporation; and	Image: Non- Hearing Summary of Issue Hearing Date 8-31-2011 for services provided to any person who is or was a subscriber of, or who is or was insured by, DDNJ and/or was entitled to benefits under a plan for which DDNJ processed and/or paid claims for dental services. Not set 08-CV-04883 (N.D. Ill.) In re: Aftermarket Filters Antitrust Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Defendants conspired to illegally fix, raise, maintain, and/or stabilize prices and allocate customers for Light Duty Aftermarket Filters purchased in the U.S., in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act from 3-1-1999 to (Date of Preliminary Approval of Settlement), 2011 causing customers to pay a higher price than they otherwise would have paid in a competitive market for light duty Aftermarket Filters. Not set 10-CV-0198 (W.D. Wash.) Arthur et. Al v. Sallie Mae, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Sallie Mae or another affiliate or subsidiary of SLM Corporation (including Arrow Financial Services, LLC: Asset Performance Group, LLC: General Revenue Corporation; SLM Financial Corporation; and Student Assistance Corporation; and Student Assistance Corporation) made automated Not set

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue Members on their cellular telephones without their prior express consent. The Representative Plaintiffs claim that these practices violate the TCPA. A list of all affiliates or subsidiaries that may have made the automated calls can be found on the Settlement Website. Class Members are all persons to whom, on or after 10-27-2005 to 9-14-2010, Sallie Mae or any other affiliate or subsidiary of SLM Corporation placed a non-emergency automated call to a cellular telephone.	Date	
10-26-2011	08-CV-4906	(S.D.N.Y.)	In re: NexCen Brands, Inc. Securities Litigation Plaintiffs allege that on 5-19-2008, the Company disclosed that (1) the 1-2008 amendment included an accelerated redemption feature, requiring a balloon payment that NexCen was unlikely to be able to pay; (2) the Company would soon face a cash shortage of \$7 million to \$10 million; (3) the public could no longer rely on the Company's reported 2007 financial results; and (4) there was "substantial doubt" about the company's ability to continue as a going-concern. On 5- 13-2010, NexCen announced that it was selling its franchise businesses and management operations and would be dissolving the Company. Class Members are all who purchased the publicly-traded common stock of NexCen Brands, Inc. during the period from 3-13-2007 through 5- 18-2008.	12-2-2011	For more information contact: Lisa M. Mezzetti Matthew B. Kaplan Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll PLLC 1100 New York Ave, NW Suite 500 West Tower Washington, DC 2005 www.cohenmilstein.com

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
10-27-2011	08-CV-01821	(D. Ariz.)	<pre>In Re: Medicis Pharmaceutical Corp. Securities Litigation Plaintiffs allege that after a review by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's ("PCAOB") audit of Medicis's 2007 financial statements, Medicis revealed that it was required to disclose and correct GAAP violations. According to Class Plaintiffs, the announcement of Medicis's restatement caused Medicis's stock to drop \$2.34 per share, or 13% on high trading volume.</pre> Class Members are all persons and entities that purchased or otherwise acquired Medicis Pharmaceutical Corporation ("Medicis") common stock, or that purchased and/or sold options on Medicis's common stock from 10-30-2003 to 9-23- 2008, inclusive.	Not set yet	For more information go to: www.gcginc.com (click on "Cases" and then click on "Medicis Pharmaceutical Corp. Securities Litigation") Or Class Counsel http://www.pomlaw.com
10-27-2011	08-CV-6992	(N.D. Ill.)	<pre>Americana Art China Co., Inv. V. Foxfire Printing and Packaging, Inc. Plaintiff alleged that Defendant violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA") by faxing unsolicited advertisements to the Class. Class Members are all persons to whom Foxfire or its agents, including but not limited to Westfax, Inc. and FAXTS, Inc., sent facsimiles</pre>	2-1-2012	For more information Contact: Phillip A. Bock BOCK & HATCH, LLC 134 N. La Salle St., Ste. 1000 Chicago, IL 60602

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue advertising Foxfire's products or services during the period 2-15-2008 through 11-6-2008 (the "Class").	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
10-28-2011	08-CV-06833	(N.D. Ill.)	<pre>Neil v. Zell, et al. Plaintiffs allege that (1) Defendants breached their fiduciary duties by paying more than fair market value for the Tribune stock it bought on 4-1-2007; (2) Defendants engaged in a prohibited transaction under ERISA and breached their fiduciary duties by purchasing unregistered stock at a time when Tribune stock was trading on the public market; and (3) Defendants otherwise breached their fiduciary duties in the 2007 Leveraged Employees Stock Option Purchase (ESOP) Transaction. Class Members are all individuals who are or, at any time on or after the 2007 Leveraged ESOP Transaction, were (1) participants in the Tribune ESOP who received or were entitled to an allocation to their ESOP Stock Account and/or ESOP Cash Account; or (2) beneficiaries of such participants.</pre>	1-30-2012	For more information visit: www.tribunesettlement. com