|  **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3-1-2018** | **16-CV-1062** | **(W.D. Tex.)** | **Brendan J. Welsh, et al. v. Navy Federal Credit Union**Plaintiffs allege that Navy Federal improperly calculated coverage for some Navy Federal members under the terms of its Guaranteed Asset Protection Plan. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write, call or e-mail:****Benjamin Bingham****Bingham & Lea, P.C.****319 Maverick Street****San Antonio, TX 78212****210 224-2885 (Ph.)****ben@.binghamandlea.com** |
| **3-1-2018** | **16-CV-02627** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re LendingClub Securities**Plaintiff alleges that LendingClub, Laplanche and Dolan made certain misstatements and omissions concerning LendingClub’s internal controls, data integrity and security, and related-party transaction in communications with investors who purchased LendingClub common stock from 12-11-2014 through 5-6-2016, and that these Defendants violated §10(b) of the Exchange Act, as well as SEC Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, by making such statements or omissions knowingly or with extreme recklessness, and caused the price of LendingClub common stock to be artificially inflated during the period from 12-11-2014 through 5-6-2016. | **Not set yet**Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more information write to:****Robbins Geller Rudman** **& Dowd LLP****Theodore J. Pintar****655 West Broadway****Suite 1900****San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **3-2-2018** | **17-CV-095** | **(W.D.N.C.)** | **Ella Matthews, et al. v. TCL Communications, Inc., et al.**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants marketed, warranted and sold Alcatel OneTouch Idol 3 4.7 inch and 5.5 inch smartphones as possessing compatibility with LTE Band 12, a frequency on which mobile phones operate for high speed communication. Plaintiffs further contend that Defendants removed LTE Band compatibility from all OneTouch Idol 3 Smartphones in a software update, greatly reducing the functionality of the OneTouch Idol 3 Smartphones. Plaintiffs assert legal claims on behalf of themselves and all members of the “Settlement Class,” defined below. These claims include claims that Defendants violated the North Carolina Unfair and Deceptive Trade Practices Act, the Kentucky Consumer Protection Act, and breached express and implied warranties to purchasers of the OneTouch Idol 3 Smartphones. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Nicholas A. Migliaccio****Migliaccio & Rathod LLP****412 H Street, N.E.****Suite 302****Washington, DC 20002** |
| **3-2-2018** | **16-CV-03703** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Exhaust Systems****In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Tenneco Inc., Tenneco GmbH, and Tenneco Automotive Operating Co., Inc. (collectively, the “Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants agreed to unlawfully raise the price of a certain kind of vehicle component part. (For example, one lawsuit is called In re: Radiators and the affected product are radiators.) As a result of the alleged agreements by Defendants, consumers and businesses that purchased or leased qualifying new vehicles (not for resale) containing those parts or who indirectly purchased qualifying replacement parts (not for resale) from the Defendants may have paid more than they should have. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.AutoPartsClass.com**](http://www.AutoPartsClass.com) |
| **3-2-2018** | **6-CV-04481** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Eubank, et al. v. Pella Corporation, et al.****Re Defendants: Pella Corporation and Pella Window and Doors, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege Pella ProLine® Casement Windows manufactured by Pella Corporation contain defects that have caused water intrusion resulting in damage to the windows and/or Plaintiffs’ property; that some Pella ProLine® Casement Window owners have paid for repairs or replacements of these windows and property; and that some owners currently require or may in the future require repairs or replacements of these windows and property. The Lawsuit asserts claims against Defendants for violation of Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act and substantially similar laws of certain other States, and declaratory relief based on alleged defects that have caused or will continue to cause damage to owners’ homes or personal property allegedly resulting from water-related intrusion.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**http://www.pellawindowsettlement.com/**](http://www.pellawindowsettlement.com/) |
| **3-2-2018** | **13-CV-418** | **(E.D.N.C.)** | **Longo v. Trojan Horse Ltd.**Plaintiffs claim that they and other participating employees in the Plan contributed a portion of their wages into the Plan, but those contributions were never deposited by the Trojan Horse Companies. Plaintiffs claim Ascensus, which was directed trustee for the Plan, violated the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”), by not ensuring the contributions were properly paid into the Plan on behalf of Class Members. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Stephen A. Dunn****Emanuel and Dunn****P.O. Box 426****Raleigh, NC 37602****919 832-0399 (Ph.)** |
| **3-6-2018** | **16-CV-02355** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Jezen Canlas, et al. v. Aircraft Service International, Inc.**Plaintiffs filed a Class Action Complaint against Aircraft Service International, Inc. on behalf of non-exempt employees alleging (1) failure to provide meal period compensation; (2) failure to provide rest period compensation; (3) unpaid wages; (4) failure to pay overtime compensation; (5) waiting time penalties; (6) failure to furnish accurate wage statements; (7) unfair compensation in violation of Ca. Bus. & Prof. Code sections 17200, et seq.; and (8) civil penalties pursuant to the Private Attorney General Act, Cal. Lab. Code 3 sections 2698, et seq. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Arlo Garcia Uriarte****Un Kei Wu****Ernesto Sanchez****Daniel Iannitelli****Liberation Law Group, P.C.****2760 Mission Street****San Francisco, CA 94110****415 695-1000 (Ph.)****415 695-1006 (Fax)** |
| **3-6-2018** | **17-CV-81027** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Jacob Horn, et al. v. iCan Benefit Group LLC**Plaintiffs allege that iCan sent text messages to Plaintiff’s wireless telephone number without prior express written consent in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227. | **6-12-2018** | **For more information write to:****Manuel S. Hiraldo****HIRALDO P.A.****401 E. Las Olas Boulevard****Suite 1400****Ft. Lauderdale, FL. 33301** |
| **3-8-2018** | **12-CV-2389** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Facebook, Inc. IPO Securities and Derivative Litigation**Plaintiff alleges that the offering materials for Facebook’s 5-12-2012 IPO were false and misleading because Facebook did not disclose that, prior to the IPO, it had learned that a trend of increasing mobile usage had negatively impacted Facebook’s advertising business, and, as a result, it had cut its revenue estimates for the second quarter of 2012 and full year 2012. The Action alleges that Defendants are liable for these allegedly false and misleading statements under Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 (the “Securities Act”). | **9-5-2018** | **For more information write to:****Bernstein Litowitz Berger** **& Grossmann LLP****John Rizio-Hamilton****1251 Avenue of the Americas****44th Floor****New York, NY 10020** |
| **3-6-2018** | **12-MD-02311****16-CV-04002****16-CV-04002** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Auto Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Steel Tubes (Auto Dealership Plaintiffs)****In re: Steel Tubes (End-Payor Plaintiffs)****Re Defendants: Maruyasu Industries Co., Ltd., Curtis-Maruyasu America, Inc. (together, “Maruyasu”), Usui Kokusai Sangyo Kaisha, Ltd.,****and Usui International Corporation (together, “Usui”) (all as defined below, and collectively, “Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants and unnamed co-conspirators, manufacturers and/or suppliers of Automotive Steel Tubes (defined below) globally and in the United States, for engaging in a long-running conspiracy to unlawfully fix, artificially raise, maintain and/or stabilize prices, rig bids for, and allocate the market and customers in the United States for Automotive Steel Tubes. According to the United States Department of Justice (“DOJ”), Defendants’ conspiracy successfully targeted the long-struggling United States automotive industry, raising prices for car manufacturers and automobile dealers alike. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****BARRETT LAW GROUP, P.A.****P.O. Box 927****404 Court Square****Lexington, MS 39095****CUNEO GILBERT & LaDUCA, LLP****4725 Wisconsin Avenue, NW****Suite 200****Washington, DC 20016** |
| **3-8-2018** | **15-CV-02905** | **(N.D. (Ill.)** | **Carver v. Presence Health Network**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants denied Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”) protections to the participants and beneficiaries of the Plans, which are defined benefit pension plan sponsored by Presence Health Network, by claiming that the Plans qualify as ERISA-exempt “church plans.” The complaint further alleges that asserting this exemption caused Defendants to deny the Plans’ participants the protections of ERISA. These include, among other violations: underfunding the Plans by over $175 million, failing to furnish Plaintiffs or any member of the class with a Pension Benefit Statement, Summary Annual Reports, Notification of Failure to Meet Minimum Funding, or Funding Notices, and as to the RHC Plan, failure to provide an ERISA-compliant schedule for vesting. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Lynn Lincoln Sarko****Laura R. Gerber****Keller Rohrback L.L.P.****1201 Third Avenue****Suite 3200****Seattle, WA 98101****206 623-3384 (Ph.)** |
| **3-9-2018** | **14-CV-02329** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Free Range Content, Inc. v. Google LLC**Plaintiffs brought this class action lawsuit against Google Inc., as predecessor to Google LLC (“Google” or “Defendant”), and alleged that when Google terminated AdSense publishers for alleged breach of contract, it improperly withheld unpaid amounts in those publishers’ AdSense accounts. Plaintiffs allege that Google’s conduct, among other things, breached the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.AdSensePublisherSettlement.com**](http://www.AdSensePublisherSettlement.com) |
| **3-9-2018** | **14-CV-06446** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Juan Castro, Jr. v. Sovran Self Storage, Inc. t/a Uncle Bob’s Self Storage, Sovran Acquisitions LP and Uncle Bob’s Management LLC**Plaintiff alleges that the Rental Agreement, the Insurance Form, and the Notice to Vacate include provisions that violate the New Jersey Truth-in-Consumer Contract Warranty and Notice Act, N.J.S.A. 56:12-14, et seq. (“TCCWNA”) and the New Jersey Consumer Fraud Act, N.J.S.A. 56:8-1 et seq. (“CFA”). Plaintiff also asserted (i) that Sovran violated the TCCWNA and the CFA by allegedly engaging in the unlicensed sale of insurance; (ii) that Sovran violated the CFA by allegedly failing to provide a copy of the insurance certificate to him; (3) that Defendants violated the CFA because the insurance program allegedly was “phantom coverage” that did not cover mold and mildew-related property losses Plaintiff suffered during the lease; and (4) that Defendants violated the CFA by allegedly charging “inflated” or “unconscionably high” premiums for the property damage insurance. | **6-11-2018** | **For more information write or call:****Michael A. Galpern****Andrew P. Bell****Charles N. Riley****James A Barry****The Locks Law Firm, LLC****801 N. Kings Highway****Cherry Hill, NJ 08034****866 298-9934 (Ph.)** |
| **3-9-2018** | **15-CV-02184** | **(D. Minn.)** | **Beecroft v. Altisource Business**Plaintiff alleges that Altisource violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act by using an automatic telephone dialing system to call cell phones without the prior express consent of the recipients. | **3-12-2018** | **For more information write or visit:****Alexander H Burke****Burke Law Offices, LLC****155 N. Michigan Avenue** **Suite 9020****Chicago, IL 60601**[**www.altisourcetcpasettlement.com**](http://www.altisourcetcpasettlement.com) |
| **3-12-2018** | **14-CV-3577** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Ply Gem Holdings, Inc. Security Litigation**Lead Plaintiff alleges that some or all of the Defendants violated Sections 11, 12(a)(2), and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”). The Complaint alleged that Defendants violated the federal securities law by allegedly failing to make required disclosures about Ply Gem’s operations and financial results, including the effects of a 2012 supply agreement and sales of vinyl siding. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN** **& DOWD LLP****Robert M. Rothman****58 South Service Road Suite 200****Melville, NY 11747** |
| **3-13-2018** | **14-MD-2503** | **(D. Mass.)** | **In re: Solodyn Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendant: Medicis Pharmaceutical Corp. (“Medicis”)**Plaintiffs allege that the Medicis and Impax violated federal antitrust laws by unlawfully impairing the introduction of generic versions of the prescription drug Solodyn into the United States market. Plaintiffs allege that Medicis entered into an illegal reverse payment agreement with Impax that impaired generic Solodyn competition. Plaintiffs claim that this alleged conduct suppressed or eliminated competition that Medicis would have faced. The Plaintiffs further claim that class members were injured as a result of the challenged conduct by paying more for extended-release minocycline hydrochloride tablets. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Thomas M. Sobol****Lauren G. Barnes Kiersten A. Taylor HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL**  **SHAPIRO LLP** **55 Cambridge Parkway Suite 301****Cambridge, MA 02142****617 482-3700 (Ph.)** |
| **3-14-2018** | **16-CV-04261** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Gergetz v. Telenav, Inc.**This lawsuit alleges that Telenav sent text messages to cellphones in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et. seq. The Class Representative claims that Telenav sent text messages encouraging recipients to download the “Scout” mobile application to cellphone users who never provided prior express consent. The Class Representative also claims that Telenav continued sending text messages to cellphone users who had responded with a “STOP” or similar command to prior messages, and that the subsequent messages went beyond merely confirming the opt-out request. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Patrick Peluso****Woodrow & Peluso, LLC****3900 East Mexico Avenue Denver, CO 80210****Stefan Coleman** **Office of Stefan Coleman,** **P.A.,****1072 Madison Ave****# 1****Lakewood, NJ 08701** |
| **3-14-2018** | **15-CV-10599** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Ashby Henderson, et al. v. BNY Mellon, N.A.**This lawsuit alleges that (i) BNY Mellon’s investment of trust assets in mutual funds or other investment vehicles affiliated with Defendants was a breach of its fiduciary duty, and that (ii) BNY Mellon breached its fiduciary duty by failing to disclose the delegation of certain fiduciary tax return preparation-related duties to third party PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (“PwC”), and allegedly “marking up” the fees that PwC charged BNY Mellon in conjunction with the preparation of the fiduciary tax returns. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****John Roddy** **Elizabeth Ryan** **Bailey & Glasser LLP****99 High Street, Suite 304 Boston, MA 02110** **617 439-6730 (Ph.)** |
| **3-9-2018** | **16-CV-1224** | **(D.N.J.)** | **In re: PTC Therapeutics, Inc. Securities Litigation**The Action arises out of Defendants’ allegedly false and misleading representations concerning PTC’s development of Translarna, a drug for treating an extremely rare genetic disorder called nonsense-mutation Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy (“nmDMD”). The Complaint alleges that the clinical trials for Translarna (the Ataluren Confirmatory Trial in DMD, “ACT DMD”), which were required for FDA Approval, failed to show substantial evidence that Translarna was effective in treating nmDMD and that, as a result, FDA approval would not be obtained. The NDA for Translarna was rejected on 2-22-2016, as communicated by the FDA through a Refuse-to-File (“RTF”) letter. When the market learned about the FDA’s rejection of the Translarna NDA on 2-23- 2016, the price of PTC’s share price dropped substantially. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Labaton Sucharow LLP James W. Johnson****140 Broadway****New York, NY 10005** **Levi & Korsinsky LLP Nicholas I. Porritt****1101 30th Street N.W. Suite 115** **Washington, DC 20007** |
| **3-16-2018** | **17-CV-02760** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Sung v. Schurman Fine Paper**Plaintiffs allege that certain Employees were informed that unknown individuals had filed or attempted to file fraudulent tax returns in their names with the Internal Revenue Service, and state taxing authorities, in addition to other forms of real or attempted identity theft. Plaintiffs also allege that certain of those Employees learned that the fraudulent tax returns were jointly filed, on behalf of themselves and their spouses, and included their spouses’ Social Security number. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or visit:****Rosemary M. Rivas****Quentin A. Roberts****Levi & Korsinsky, LLP****44 Montgomery Street Suite 650****San Francisco, CA 94104**[**www.zlk.com**](http://www.zlk.com) |
| **3-16-2018** | **14-CV-02787** | **(D. Colo.)** | **O’Dowd v. Rocky Mountain Hospital and Medical Service, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Rocky Mountain Hospital Service, Inc. d/b/a Anthem Blue Shield (“Anthem Colorado”(, and Anthem, Inc. (collectively, the “Defendants”)**This lawsuit is about whether Anthem Colorado violated the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”) and Colorado law by how it reimbursed claims for certain behavioral health services rendered by Out-Of-Network Providers, i.e., physicians and other healthcare practitioners who were not part of Anthem Colorado’s provider network(s) when they provided services. Plaintiff claims that the fee schedule that Anthem Colorado used to reimburse for behavioral health services was different from the main fee schedule Anthem Colorado used to reimburse for other (non-behavioral) medical services. Plaintiff claims the difference in reimbursement methodologies resulted in lower payment for Out-of-Network Behavioral Health Services and deprived Plaintiff and other Plan Members of benefits that were allegedly owed under their respective health benefit Plans.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****D. Brian Hufford** **Jason Cowart Zuckerman** **Spaeder LLP** **485 Madison Avenue****10th Floor** **New York, NY 10022** **212 704-9600 (Ph.)****212 704-4256 (Fax)****dbhufford@zuckerman.com****jcowart@zuckerman.com** |
| **3-19-2018** | **12-MD-02311****13-CV-01203****13-CV-01703** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Automotive Lamps****In re: HID Ballasts****Re Defendants: Stanley Electric Co., Stanley Electric U.S. Co., Inc., and II Stanley Co., Inc. (collectively “Stanley”)**End-Payor Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of Stanley’s participation in unlawful conspiracies to raise, fix, maintain, and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for (1) Automotive Lamps in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act and various state antitrust, unfair completion, unjust enrichment, and consumer protection laws as set forth in End-Payor Plaintiffs’ Second Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint (Case No. 2:13-VC-01203, Doc. No. 81) (“Lamps Complaint”), and (2) HID Ballasts in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act and various state antitrust, unfair completion, unjust enrichment and consumer protection laws as set for the in End-Payor Plaintiffs’ Second Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint (Case No. 2:130CV-01703, Doc. No. 208) (“Ballasts Complaint”) (together with the Lamps Complaint, the “Complaint”). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Cotchett, Pitre, &** **McCarthy LLP****San Francisco Airport** **Office Center****840 Malcolm Road****Suite 200****Burlingame, CA 94010****Robins Kaplan LLP****399 Park Avenue****Suite 3600****New York, NY 10022****Susman Godfrey L.L.P.****1901 Avenue of the Stars****Suite 950****Los Angeles, CA 90067** |
| **3-19-2018** | **14-CV-01873** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Maria Stapleton, et al. v. Advocate Health Care Network and Subsidiaries, et al.****Re Defendants: Advocate Health Care Network, Kevin R. Brady, the Benefit Plan Administrative Committee for Church Plans of Advocate Health Care Network, Jane and John Does 1-20, members of the Benefits Plan Administrative Committee for Church Plans of Advocate Health Care Network, John and Jane Does 21-40, members of the Compensation and Benefits Committee of the Board of Directors of Advocate Health Care Network, and John and Jane Does 41-60 (“Advocate”), (“Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants denied the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”) protections to the participants and beneficiaries of the Plan, which is a defined benefit pension plan sponsored by Advocate, by claiming that the Plan qualifies as an ERISA-exempt “church plan.” The complaint further alleges that asserting this exemption caused Defendants to deny the Plan’s participants the protections of ERISA. These include, among other violations: underfunding the Plan, failing to furnish Plaintiffs or any member of the class with a Pension Benefit Statement, Summary Annual Reports, Notification of Failure to Meet Minimum Funding, or Funding Notices, and failure to provide an ERISA-compliant schedule for vesting. | **6-27-2018** | **For more information visit:**[**www.kellersettlements.com**](http://www.kellersettlements.com)[**www.cohenmilstein.com/advocate-settlement**](http://www.cohenmilstein.com/advocate-settlement) |
| **3-19-2018** | **8-CV-03384** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Sun Trust Bank, Inc. ERISA Litigation**Plaintiffs alleged that Defendants were fiduciaries of the Plan and that they breached fiduciary duties owed to the Plan’s participants by, among other things, continuing to permit investment in SunTrust Stock through the Plan and failing to take appropriate action when such investments allegedly became imprudent. Named Plaintiffs also alleged liability for failure to monitor other fiduciary Defendants and co-fiduciary liability. Named Plaintiffs further alleged that because they and other Plan participants invested in SunTrust Stock through the Plan, their retirement accounts lost value. During the litigation, the Court dismissed certain claims and certain defendants. On 6-18-2015, it granted in part, and denied in part, Defendants’ 1-29-2015 motion to dismiss. On 8-17-2016, the Court entered a Class Certification Order certifying a class consisting of participants in or beneficiaries of the Plan at any time between 5-15-2007 and 3-30-2011, inclusive, and whose accounts included investments in SunTrust Stock during that period and who sustained a loss to their account as a result of the investment in SunTrust Stock. On 10-5-2016, the Court granted dismissal of certain defendants. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Mark K. Gyandoh****Kessler Topaz Meltzer**  **& Check, LLP****280 King of Prussia Road****Radnor, PA 19087****610 667-7706 (Ph.)****610 667-7056 (Fax)** |
| **3-20-2018** | **16-CV-02355** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Jezen Canlas, et al. v. Aircraft Service International, Inc.**With regard to 28 U.S.C. § 1715(b)(2), a preliminary approval hearing regarding ASIG’s settlement has been re-noted to 6-8-2018. For more information please see CAFA Notice dated 3-6-2018 above. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Arlo Garcia Uriarte****Un Kei Wu****Ernesto Sanchez****Daniel Iannitelli****Liberation Law Group, P.C.****2760 Mission Street****San Francisco, CA 94110****415 695-1000 (Ph.)****415 695-1006 (Fax)** |
| **3-21-2018** | **15-CV-1944** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **In re: Akorn, Inc. Securities Litigation**The Amended Complaint asserted claims under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 related to alleged misrepresentations and omissions made to Akorn investors between May 6, 2014 and April 24, 2015. These alleged misrepresentations and omissions primarily concerned inaccuracies in Akorn’s reported financial results and material weaknesses in Akorn’s internal controls over financial reporting during this period. | **4-2-2018** | **For more information write to:****Joshua L. Crowell** **GLANCY PRONGAY & MURRAY LLP 1925 Century Park East****Suite 2100** **Los Angeles, CA 90067****Patrick V. Dahlstrom POMERANTZ LLP 10 South LaSalle Street****Suite 3505** **Chicago, Illinois 60603** |
| **3-22-2018** | **07-CV-05634** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Transpacific Passenger Air Transportation Antitrust Litigation**Plaintiffs allege that thirteen Defendants and their alleged co-conspirators agreed to fix the prices of airline tickets for travel between the United States and Asia/Oceania. As a result, ticket purchasers may have paid more than was necessary. The Defendant airlines deny they did anything wrong and theDefendants who have agreed to settle the case have done so with no admission of liability. One of the Defendants—All Nippon Airways Company, Limited—has pled guilty to fixing the prices of certain discounted tickets for transpacific air transportation sold in the United States from at least as early as 4-1-2000 until at least 4-1-2004. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call or visit:****1-800-439-1781 (Ph.)**[**WWW.AIRLINESETTLEMENT.COM**](http://WWW.AIRLINESETTLEMENT.COM) |
| **3-22-2018** | **14-MD-02591** | **(D Kan.)** | **In re: Syngenta****Re Defendants: Syngenta AG, Syngenta Corporation, Syngenta Crop Protection AG, Syngenta Crop Protection LLC, and Syngenta Seeds, LLC (f/k/a Synghenta Seeds, Inc.), (collectively witrh all of their affiliates and predecessor and successor entities, “Syngenta”)**Plaintiff alleges that Syngenta sold Viptera and Duracade corn seed before it should have because the MIR 162 and Event 5307 genetically modified traits contained in those seeds had not yet received import approval in China. The lawsuits argue that Syngenta should have waited to sell those seeds until it had obtained import approval in China and that Syngenta did not take reasonable steps to ensure that the seed was sold in a manner that corn harvested from Viptera and Duracade seed did not contaminate portions of the United States (“U.S.”) corn supply exported to China. The lawsuits claim that China began rejecting shipments of U.S. corn after allegedly detecting Viptera traits in shipments from the U.S., causing the U.S. corn industry to lose access to the Chinese market and resulting in lower corn prices. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call or visit:****1-833-567-CORN (Ph.)**[**www.CornSeedSettlement.com**](http://www.CornSeedSettlement.com)**.** |
| **3-23-2018** | **15-CV-00558****15-CV-00391** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **Olga Anderson, et al. v. Trans Union LLC****Carolyn Clark v. Trans Union LLC**The lawsuits claim that TransUnion failed to disclose its third-party vendor from which TransUnion obtains its public record information and that TransUnion reported inaccurate and out-of-date public record information in violation of the Fair Credit Reporting Act. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Leonard A. Bennett****Consumer Litigation**  **Associates** **763 J Clyde Morris Boulevard****Suite 1A****Newport News, VA 23601** |
| **3-26-2018** | **15-CV-01026** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Schourup v. Private Label Nutraceuticals LLC**The lawsuit claims advertising/labeling concerning the products was not true. The manufacturer of the green coffee extract Products stands by its advertising/labeling and denies it did anything wrong, but has settled to avoid the cost and distraction of the lawsuit. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Kley Grombacher****Bradley Grombacher, LLP****2815 Townsgate Road****Suite 130****Westlake Village, CA 91361** |
| **3-26-2018** | **16-CV-00611** | **(W.D. Wash.)** | **Abdikhadar Jama, et al. Golden Gate America LLC, et al.**Plaintiffs allege that Defendant jointly employed Golden Gate employees at the SeaTac location, and was therefore required to pay a minimum wage of $15 per hour in 2014 and of $15.24 in 2015 and part of 2016 to the members of the Settlement Class, but that it failed to do so. In the Complaint, Plaintiffs asserted causes of action for the losses suffered by the Settlement Class as the result of the alleged actions by the Defendant. | **7-31-2018** | **For more information write, call or fax:****BADGLEY MULLINS TURNER****Duncan C. Turner****19929 Ballinger Way NE****Suite 200****Seattle, WA 98155****206 621-6566 (Ph.)****206 621-9686 (Fax)** |
| **3-26-2018** | **8-CV-02222** | **(D. Kan.)** | **Rick Harlow, et al. v. Sprint Nextel Corporation, et al.**The lawsuit alleges that because of problems with Sprint’s commissions system, Sprint did not pay all of the commissions due to former or current business channel employees. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or visit:****Michele Fisher****Paul Lukas****NICHOLS KASTER, PLLP****4600 IDS Center****80 South 8th Street****Minneapolis, MN 55402****612 256-3200 (Ph.)**[**www.nka.com**](http://www.nka.com) |
| **3-26-2018** | **8-CV-2063** | **(D. Kan.)** | **Roxie Sibley, et al. v. Sprint Nextel Corporation**Same as above. | **Not set yet** | **For more information:** **Same as above** |
| **3-27-2018** | **17-CV-0182** | **(D. Utah)** | **In re: Lipocine Inc. Security Litigation****Re Defendants: Mahesh V. Patel and Morgan R. Brown (“Defendants”)**This is a federal securities class action on behalf of a class consisting of all persons other than Defendants who purchased or otherwise acquired Lipocine securities between6-30-2015 and 6-28-2016, both dates inclusive (the “Class Period”). Plaintiff seeks to recover compensable damages caused by Defendants’ violations of the federal securities laws and to pursue remedies under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b5 promulgated thereunder, against the Company and certain of its officers and/or directors. | **Not set yet** | **For more information, write, call or fax:****Roberta D. Liebenberg****Jeffrey S. Istvan****Paul Costa****Kine, Kaplan and Black, RPC****One South Broad Street****23rd Floor****Philadelphia, PA 19107****215 567-6565 (Ph.)****215 568-5872 (Fax)** |
| **3-30-2018** | **14-CV-755** | **(D. Conn.)** | **Perez v. Higher One Holdings, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Mark Volchek, Miles Lasater, Jeffrey Wallace and Dean Hatton (“Defendants”)**Plaintiffs assert claims under Sections §§10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b) & 78t(a), and Securities and Exchange Commission Rule 10b-5, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5. Specifically, Plaintiffs allege that Higher One’s pre-Class Period misconduct included improper marketing of and fees charged on OneAccounts and debit cards in violation of §5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (“FTC Act”), which was addressed by a 2012 Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (“FDIC”) Consent Order and settlement of a consumer class action, both barring future misconduct. Plaintiffs further allege that throughout the Class Period, Higher One did not comply with the 2012 FDIC Consent Order and continued its prior misconduct, including violating FTC Act §5. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants made false and/or misleading statements and/or omissions between 8-7-2012 to 8-6-2014, inclusive regarding Higher One’s marketing and disclosure practices, compliance with the Federal Trade Commission Act, and compliance with a previously-issued consent order and settlement obligations, therby exposing Higher One to large potential civil penalties and restitution obligations. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Matthew L. Tuccillo POMERANTZ LLP** **600 Third Avenue****20th Floor****New York, NY 10016** |
| **3-30-2018** | **15-MD-02627****16-MD-02743** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **In re: Lumber Liquidators Chinese-Manufactured Laminate Flooring Products Marketing Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation****In re: Lumber Liquidators Chinese – Manufactured Laminate Flooring Durability Marketing, Sales Practices Litigation**Plaintiff alleges that the Chinese-manufactured laminate flooring sold by Lumber Liquidators did not comply with the labeling on the box which stated that the flooring complied with the California Air Resources Board regulations for formaldehyde levels in laminate flooring. The other lawsuit (MDL 2743) alleges that the same flooring does not meet the industry standards for durability and scratch-resistance, making the flooring less durable than advertised. | **10-3-2018** | **For more information visit:**[**www.LaminateSettlement.com**](http://www.LaminateSettlement.com) |
| **3-30-2018** | **17-CV-00141** | **(E.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Outer Banks Power Outage Litigation**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants PCL Civil Constructors, Inc. and PCL Construction Enterprises, Inc. (hereafter “PCL” or “Defendants”) in the course of performing construction work on the Herbert C. Bonner Bridge severed the sole power cable that provides electricity to the Hatteras Island and Ocracoke Island. In response to a lack of electrical power, governmental agencies with authority over Islands issued mandatory evacuations for visitors to the Islands. This mandatory evacuation for visitors remained in place until Friday, 8-4-2017. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[www.obxsettlement.com](http://www.obxsettlement.com) |
| **3-30-2018** | **14-MD-02521** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Lidoderm Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Actavis, Inc. (f/k/a Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.), Watson Laboratories, Inc., and Actavis plc (together, “Watson”), Endo Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (“Endo”), and Teikoku Pharma USA, Inc. and Teikoku Seiyaku Co., Ltd. (together, “Teikoku” together with Watson and Endo, “Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated federal antitrust laws by entering into an anticompetitive agreement that delayed or blocked the market entry of less expensive, generic versions of Lidoderm. Specifically, the Direct Purchaser Class Plaintiffs allege that Endo and Teikoku agreed to pay Watson with brand Lidoderm patches and by agreeing not to start selling an authorized generic version of Lidoderm until 7.5 months after Watson launched its generic Lidoderm. Direct Purchaser Class Plaintiffs further allege that, in exchange for these payments, Watson agreed to delay selling its generic version of Lidoderm, thereby reducing competition from less expensive generic versions of Lidoderm. Direct Purchaser Class Plaintiffs allege that they were injured because they were overcharged for their purchases of brand and/or generic Lidoderm because of the delay in the availability of less expensive, generic versions of Lidoderm, including an authorized generic Lidoderm. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[www.faruqilaw.com](http://www.faruqilaw.com) |
| **3-30-2018** | **15-CV-05841** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: KaloBios Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Securities Litigation**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants made material misrepresentations and omissions, knowingly and recklessly, concerning KaloBios business operations and prospects and prior alleged misconduct by Defendant Shkreli at other companies. On 11-18-2015, KaloBios issued a press release listing Mr. Cross as the company contact stating that KaloBios was “in discussions with Mr. Shkreli regarding possible direction for the company to continue in operation.” It also quoted Mr. Martell as saying, “We received communications from Mr. Shkreli informing us of his group’s ownership position, and a proposal to continue the company’s operations. Our board of directors is prepared to entertain any constructive proposal, which we will act upon promptly.” Plaintiffs allege that these statements were knowingly or recklessly false or misleading by misrepresenting that KaloBios and its Board were vetting Defendant Shkreli’s leadership proposals and making an informed decision about whether to hand him operational control. | **8-2-2018** | **For more information write to:****Matthew L. Tuccillo****Pomerantz LLP****600 Third Avenue****New York, NY 10016** |