

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
12-4-2012	11-CV-00166	(E.D. La.)	<p>Anthony Felix & Donnie Jo Harb v. Northstar Location Services, LLC Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants violated both the federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") and the California Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("RFDCPA").</p> <p>Class Members are all persons with addresses in the United States of America who received a voice message left by Defendant on a telephone answering device, or who engaged in a telephone communication with Defendant, wherein the Defendant did not identify itself by its company name as the caller, state the purpose or nature of the communication or disclose that the communication was from a debt collector, or where the Defendant did not disclose at the outset of a communication that the call may be monitored or recorded, or where the Defendant 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 and including the date of order granting preliminary certification of the Settlement Class.</p>	Not set yet	No Information
12-5-2012	08-CV-6910	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>In re: Potash Antitrust Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Defendants conspired and agreed, in violation of the antitrust laws, to restrict the supply and raise or "fix" the prices for potash sold in the United States from 7-1-2003 to the present.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or fax: Lockridge Grindal Nauen P.L.L.P. Attn: W. Joseph Bruckner 100 Washington Ave South</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Class Members are:</p> <p>Direct Purchasers: All persons and entities that purchased potash in the United States directly from one or more defendants between 7-1-2003 and 9-20-2012.</p> <p>Indirect Purchasers: All persons or entities who purchased potash or product which contain potash for end use, indirectly from one of the Defendants in the United States during 7-1-2003 through the present and in 48 states including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.</p>		<p>Suite 2200 Minneapolis, MN 55401</p> <p>612-339-6900 612-339-0981</p>
12-6-2012	09-CV-777	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>In re: Beacon Associates Litigation, Jeanneret Associates, Inc., Board of Trustees of the Buffalo Laborers Securities Fund v. J.P. Jeanneret Associates, Inc.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege multiple trustees and fiduciaries of employee benefit plans covered by ERISA that obtained management services from J.P. Jeanneret Associates, Inc. and that invested with Bernard L. Madoff, either directly with Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities, LLC ("BLMIS") or indirectly through the Income Plus Fund, the Andover Funds, and had not fully redeemed interest in BLMIS, the Income Plus Fund or the Andover Funds as of 12-11-2008, violated ERISA and breached their fiduciary roles.</p> <p>Class Members: Four Rule 23(b) (1) opt-out subclasses listed below:</p>	3-15-2013	<p>For more information see listed next to each Class Member:</p> <p>Lowey Dannenberg</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Beacon Investor Class: "All investors in the Beacon Funds as of 12-11-2008."</p> <p>Beacon Jeanneret Investor Subclass: "All persons and entities who obtained the investment management services of JPJA, John P. Jeanneret, or Paul L. Perry, and who invested in the Beacon Funds that had not fully redeemed their interests in the Beacon Funds as of 12-11-2008."</p> <p>Income Plus Investor Class: "All investors in the Income Plus Fund that had not fully redeemed their interests in the Income Plus Fund as of 12-11-2008."</p> <p>Direct Investor Class: "All investors who invested directly with Madoff pursuant to a Discretionary Investment Management Agreement with JPJA that had not fully redeemed their investments with BLMIS as of 12-11-2008."</p> <p>Beacon Fiduciary Class: "All trustees and named fiduciaries of any employee benefit plan covered by ERISA (acting in their fiduciary capacity on behalf of the plan and for the benefit of all participants and beneficiaries of the plans for which they serve as trustees) that invested in the Beacon Funds and that had not fully redeemed its interests in the Beacon Funds as of 12-11-2009."</p> <p>Buffalo Laborers Class: "all trustees and named fiduciaries of any employee benefit plan covered by ERISA (acting in their fiduciary capacity on behalf of the plan and for the benefit of all</p>		<p>Cohen & Hart, P.C.</p> <p>Wolf Haldenstein Adler</p> <p>Bernstein Liebhard LLP</p> <p>Lowey Dannenberg Cohen & Hart, P.C.</p> <p>Lowey Dannenberg Cohen & Hart, P.C.</p> <p>Lowey Dannenberg Cohen & Hart, P.C.</p> <p>Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll PLLC</p> <p>Kessler Topaz Meltzer & Check LLP</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>participants and beneficiaries of the plans for which they serve as trustees) that obtained the investment management services of J.P. Jeanneret Associates Inc. and that invested with Bernard L. Madoff, either directly with Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC ("BLMIS") or indirectly through the Income Plus fund or the Andover Funds, and that had not fully redeemed its interests in BLMIS, the Income Plus Fund or the Andover Funds as of 12-11-2009."</p> <p>Class Members: Four Rule 23(b) (1) non-opt-out classes and one Rule 23(b) (1) non-opt-out-subclass listed below:</p> <p>Beacon Participant and Beneficiary Class: "All participants and beneficiaries of any employee benefit plan covered by ERISA that invested in the Beacon Funds and that had not fully redeemed its interests in the Beacon Funds as of 12-11-2008."</p> <p>Beacon Jeanneret ERISA Subclass: "All participants and beneficiaries of any employee benefit plan covered by ERISA who obtained the investment management services of J.P. Jeanneret Associates, Inc., John P. Jeanneret, or Paul L. Perry, and who invested in the Beacon Funds that had not fully redeemed its interests in the Beacon Funds as of 12-11-2008."</p> <p>Income Plus Participant and Beneficiary Class: "All participants and beneficiaries of any employee benefit plan covered by ERISA that invested in the Income Plus Fund and that had</p>		<p>Lowey Dannenberg Cohen & Hart, P.C.</p> <p>Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll PLLC</p> <p>Lowey Dannenberg Cohen & Hart, P.C.</p> <p>Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP</p> <p>Kessler Topaz Meltzer & Check LLP</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>not fully redeemed its interests in the Income Plus Fund as of 12-11-2008."</p> <p>Andover Participant and Beneficiary Class: "All participants and beneficiaries of any employee benefit plan covered by ERISA that invested in the Andover Funds and that had not fully redeemed its interests in the Andover Funds as of 12-11-2008."</p> <p>Direct Investor Participant and Beneficiary Class: "All participants and beneficiaries of any employee benefit plan covered by ERISA that invested directly with Madoff pursuant to a Discretionary Investment Management Agreement with JPJA and that had not fully redeemed its investments with BLMIS as of 12-11-2008."</p>		<p>Kessler Topaz Meltzer & Check LLP</p> <p>Kessler Topaz Meltzer & Check LLP</p>
12-6-2012	12-CV-3693	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>Yuzary et al. v. HSBC Bank USA, N.A., HSBC USA, Inc., and HSBC North America Holdings, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants improperly classified employees who worked in Covered Positions as exempted employees who were not entitled to receive overtime pay under state and federal wage and hour laws and failed to pay them overtime premium pay for the time they worked in excess of 40 hours a week.</p> <p>Class Members are all who worked for HSBC in Covered Positions in New York between 2-7-2006 and 11-15-2012, in California between 5-9-2008 and 11-15-2012, or in Connecticut or New Jersey between 11-9-2010 and 11-15-2012. Employees who worked in Covered Positions in any state between</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Kutzman Carson Consultants LLC HSBC Overtime Settlement 599 Lexington Avenue, 39th Floor New York, NY 10022</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			5-9-2009 and 11-15-2012, but who did not work in New York, California, Connecticut, or New Jersey during the date ranges listed above, are also part of a sub-class.		
12-10-2012	09-MD-2058	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>In re: Bank of America Corp. Securities, Derivative, and ERISA Litigation</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the federal securities laws by failing to disclose or update certain financial information prior to the 12-5-2008 shareholder vote approving the issuance of additional shares in connection with the merger of Bank of America (BoA) and Merrill Lynch Company. The First Amended Complaint also alleges that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements regarding the proposed merger and deceived the investing public in violation of the federal securities laws, artificially inflated the price of BoA stock, and caused putative Class Members to purchase BoA stock at artificially inflated prices.</p> <p>All persons and entities who (1) held BoA common stock as of 10-10-2008, and were entitled to vote on the merger between BoA and Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. ("Merrill") that was consummated on 1-1-2009; (2) purchased or otherwise acquired the common stock of BoA during the period from 9-18- 2008 through 1-21-2009, inclusive, excluding shares of BoA common stock acquired by exchanging Merrill common stock for BoA common stock through the merger between the two companies; (3) purchased or otherwise acquired January 2011 call options on BoA common stock</p>	4-5-2013	<p>For more information write, call or fax</p> <p>Daniel J. Kramer Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, LLP 1285 Ave of the Americas New York, NY 10019</p> <p>212 373-3020 212 492-0020</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			during the period from 9-18-2008 through 1-21-2009, inclusive; or (4) purchased BoA common stock issued under the Registration Statement and Prospectus for the BoA common stock offering that occurred on or about 10-7-2008, and who were damaged thereby.		
12-11-2012	07-CV-1840	(D. Kan.)	<p>In re: Motor Fuel Temperature Sales Practices Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated state consumer protection and other laws by selling motor fuel to retail consumers for a specified price per gallon without disclosing or adjusting for the effects of temperature.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities who bought gasoline or diesel fuel at a gas station in Ala., Ariz., Ark., Cal., D.C., Del., Fla., Ga., Guam, Ind., Kan., Ky., La., Md., Miss., Mo., N.C., Nev., N.J., N.M., Okla., Or., Pa., S.C., Tenn., Tex., Utah, V.I., or Va., between 1-1-2001, and Preliminary Hearing Date. For some of the Settlements, Class Members must have purchased motor fuel from a station owned, operated or branded by one of the Defendants.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit or write to: www.HotFuelLitigation.com Notice Administrator at: Hot Fuel Settlement c/o Dahl Administration P.O. Box 3614 Minneapolis, MN 55403</p>
12-12-2012	11-CV-01985	(W.D. Wash.)	<p>In re: Starbucks Consumer Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Starbucks failed to disclose a \$1.50 service fee on all consumers who purchase less than a full pound of scooped coffee beans. Plaintiffs allege Starbucks used deceptive prices, was unjustly enriched by imposing this hidden service fee and violated</p>	Not set yet	No information

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>false advertising laws, consumer protection laws, and unfair competition laws nationwide.</p> <p>Class Members are unknown at this time and can be identified only through self identification during the claim process. Class consists of all persons who between 12-9-2007 and 11-7-2011 purchased from a company owned Starbucks store in the U.S., scooped coffee beans in an amount less than one pound, other than half pound purchases during January to March 2008 of coffee that had half-pound prices posted on menu boards during that time.</p>		
12-13-2012	09-CV-00300	(D.N.M.)	<p>Genesee County Employees' Retirement System v. Thornburg Mortgage Securities Trust 2006-3, et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants prepared and issued materially false and misleading registration statements, prospectuses, and prospectus supplements in violation of the SEC Act of 1933 and of the New Mexico Securities Act of 1986 in connection with the dates of the Certificates, including misrepresentations regarding the loan origination and underwriting standards; the validity of the property appraisals conducted in connection with the issuance of the loans; the loan-to-value ratios of the mortgages; and the credit ratings.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased or acquired Series 2006-3 mortgage loan pass-through certificates sponsored by Thornburg Mortgage Home Loans, Inc. and issued by</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit:</p> <p>www.gilardi.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			Thornburg Mortgage Securities Trust 2006-5 and Thornburg Mortgage Securities Trust 2007-4 during the period 6-1-2006 through 12-10-2010, inclusive.		
12-13-2012	10-CV-1712	(D. Minn.)	<p>Thorkelson, et al. v. Publishing House of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA), et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs alleged various breaches of Defendants' fiduciary duties under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and asserted claims under common law for breach of trust, breach of contract, and promissory estoppels.</p> <p>Class Members are: (i) all persons who were participants in the Retirement Plan for Employees of Augsburg Fortress Publishers, Publishing House of the ELCA or the Retirement Plan II for Employees of Augsburg Fortress Publishers, Publishing House of the ELCA (the "Plans") on 3-5-2010, (ii) if a participant was deceased, the respective participant's beneficiary pursuant to the terms of the Plans as of 3-5-2010, and (iii) any alternate payee under a qualified domestic relations order who had a separate interest in the Plans as of 3-5-2010.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or fax:</p> <p>Lockridge Grindal Nauen P.L.L.P. 100 Washington Avenue South Suite 2200 Minn, MN 55401-2179</p> <p>612 339-6900</p> <p>612 339-0981</p>
12-14-2012	11-CV-03350	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>In re: Michaels Stores Pin Pad Litigation</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that certain customers suffered damages as a result of a data breach at select Michaels Stores, Inc., between 1-1-2011</p>	Not set yet	No information

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>and 5-12-2011.</p> <p>Class Members are all who purchased items at certain Michaels store locations from 1-1-2011, to 5-12-2011, and used a Payment Card at one of the Tampered PIN Pad Terminals.</p>		
12-14-2012	11-CV-8176	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>In re: Southwest Airlines Voucher Litigation This action arose out of Southwest's decision to only redeem free drink coupons issued on or after 8-1-2010 to customers who purchased a Business Select ticket on the date of the ticketed travel. Plaintiffs allege Southwest breached its contract with customers who previously received free drink coupons through prior purchases of Business Select tickets, and were denied the ability to redeem them at any point in the future, with no expiration date or limitations.</p> <p>Class Members are all who received and have not redeemed a free drink coupon through the purchase of a Business Select Southwest ticket prior to 8-1-2010.</p>	5-21-2013	<p>For more information call or visit: 1 888-288-2153 www.southwestvouchersettlement.com</p>
12-17-2012	09-CV-1392	(W.D. Wash.)	<p>Kwan v. Clearwire Corp. Plaintiffs claimed, among other things, that Clearwire and its vendors placed calls to cellular telephones in violation of federal and state law, and made calls to people who asked not be called.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities who,</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to: Rob Williamson Williamson & Williams 2239 W. Viewmont Way W Seattle, WA 98199</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>from and including 8-31-2005, through the date of Preliminary Approval, (a) received a call from or on behalf of Clearwire on any telephone, whether for collections, solicitation, "services," or any other purposes; or (b) received a call from or on behalf of Clearwire on any telephone after they requested that Clearwire and/or its vendors stop calling; or (c) received a prerecorded solicitation call from or on behalf of Clearwire on any telephone in Washington State.</p>		
12-17-2012	11-ML-2302	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>In re: A-Power Energy Generations Systems, Ltd. Securities Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Defendants and certain of its officers and directors, and MSCM LLP ("MSCM"), violated the federal securities laws by allegedly making false and misleading statements to the investing public. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants failed to disclose among other things: (1) that A-Power overstated its revenue and assets for the years ending 12-31-2008 and 2009 and understated total liabilities, in violation of United States Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP"), and (2) the Company failed to disclose the alleged related party nature of certain significant transactions, and failed to disclose alleged additional related parties in violation of GAAP.</p>	Not set yet	No information

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
12-19-2012	11-CV-00726	(W.D. Wash.)	<p>Jason Moomjy v. HQ Sustainable Maritime Industries, Inc., Norbert Sporns and Jean-Pierre Dallaire, et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that HQSM and the Individual Defendants (which do not include Ladenburg Thalmann & Co., Inc. and Roth Capital Partners, LLC) provided false information to an outside auditor as part of a fraudulent scheme to inflate HQSM's key financial metrics, including revenue and cash on hand. Lead Plaintiff alleged that when an auditor eventually discovered evidence of misconduct, HQSM and the Individual Defendants quashed attempts by the auditor and the Company's own Audit Committee to investigate and then lied to regulators about efforts to block the independent investigation. Ultimately, the Exchange delisted HQSM, leaving Class Members with nearly worthless shares of the Company's stock.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities who purchased or otherwise acquired HQSM common stock from 5-12-2009 through and including 4-1-2011, inclusive, or who acquired common stock or warrants to purchase common stock of HQSM issued pursuant to or traceable to the 6-2009 or 8-2010 offerings, and were damaged thereby.</p>	1-13-2013	<p>For more information call, fax or visit:</p> <p>Claims Administrator, Strategic Claims Services</p> <p>866 274-4004</p> <p>610 565-7985</p> <p>www.strategicclaims.net</p>
12-20-2012	09-CV-00961	(D.N.M.)	<p>Steven J. Abraham, et al. v. BP America Production Company</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege BP failed to pay the full royalty and overriding royalty on the current value and full quantity of natural gas liquids</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or fax:</p> <p>Gallegos Law Firm, P.C. J.E. Gallegos Building 300</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>("NGLs). The NGLs that are the subject of this action are those that were extracted at the New Blanco Plant.</p> <p>Class Members are all present and former owners of oil and gas leases and wells in the San Juan Basin now or formerly held by BP America Production Company ("BP") or its predecessors-in-title, which leases contain wells that currently or have produced oil or natural gas subsequent to 12-31-2006, at the New Blanco Plant, near Bloomfield, New Mexico, and on which BP paid royalty and overriding royalty.</p>		<p>460 St. Michael's Drive Santa Fe, N.M. 87505</p> <p>505 983-6686</p> <p>505 986-1367</p> <p>McKool Smith, P.C. Thomas A. Graves Suite 1500 300 Crescent Court Dallas, Texas 75201</p> <p>214 978-4000 214 978-4044</p>
12-21-2012	10-CV-00143	(D. Vt.)	<p>Semon, et al. v. Swenson, et al. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants devised a scheme that enabled Defendant Kurt Swenson, the non-executive chairman of Rock of Ages Corporation ("ROAC") and Chairman of Swenson Granite, and certain affiliated persons, to acquire ROAC for inadequate consideration and in breach of Defendants' fiduciary duties.</p> <p>Class Members are all who held shares of ROAC common stock, either of record or beneficially, at any time during the period beginning on and including 5-7-2010, through and including 1-19-2011 (the "Class Period").</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write call or e-mail.</p> <p>Chet B. Waldman Wolf Popper LLP 845 Third Avenue New York, NY. 10022</p> <p>212 759-4600</p> <p>cwaldman@wolffopper.com</p>
12-21-2012	10-CV-1712	(D. Minn.)	<p>Thorkelson, et al. v. Publishing House of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, et al. Amended Notice of Proposed Settlement as provided in 28 U.S.C. § 1715(b) in the above-</p>		<p>For more information write, call or fax</p> <p>Nicole A. Truso Faegre Baker Daniels LLP</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			entitled matter. On 11-19-2012, Defendants served a Notice of Proposed Settlement regarding the above-captioned class action. Based on recently discovered information, Defendants have amended Appendices 4 and 5 to the original notice. The changes to these appendices relate to the following states: Alabama, California, Colorado, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee. See earlier Notice dated 12-13-2012		90 South Seventh Street Minneapolis, Minn. 55402 1 612 766-7000 1 612 766-1600
12-21-2012	08-CV-3301 12-CV-4212	(E.D. Penn.)	<p>In re: Flonase Antitrust Litigation and Medical Mutual of Ohio, Inc. v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that GlaxoSmithKline plc ("GSK") filed "sham" citizen petitions with the FDA to delay the approval of generic versions of Flonase. Plaintiffs argue that this alleged conduct suppressed or eliminated competition GSK would have faced from generic pharmaceutical manufacturers. Plaintiffs further claim that Class Members were injured by paying more for Flonase nasal spray than they would have paid otherwise and/or from being unable to purchase less expensive, generic versions of Flonase. As a result, Plaintiffs claim that Class Members were overcharged for Flonase nasal spray and its generic versions.</p> <p>Class Members are all who purchased/paid for, in whole or in part, Flonase or generic Flonase for personal, family or household consumption, anywhere in the United States and its territories, from 5-19-2004 through 3-31-2009.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to or call:</p> <p>Marvin A. Miller Lori A. Fanning Miller Law LLC 115 S. LaSalle Street Suite 2910 Chicago, IL 60603</p> <p>312 332-3400</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Michael M. Buchman 600 Third Avenue New York, NY 10016</p> <p>212 661-1100</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
12-27-2012	10-CV-07109	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>Scott A. Chamers, John C. Burnette, and Eric Schwilk v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., Merrill Lynch, Pierce Fenner & Smith, and Bank of America Corporation</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that certain Persons who were employed by Merrill Lynch as Financial Advisors as of 9-15-2008 voluntarily terminated their employment with Merrill Lynch "for Good Reason" following the merger between Bank of America Corporation and Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. and were entitled to received certain amounts under the Plans as a result of their voluntary terminations. The Class Representatives allege that Defendants breached the Plans by not providing Class Members with those amounts that they were entitled to following their terminations for "Good Reason" following a "Change in Control."</p> <p>Class Members are Merrill Lynch Financial Advisors, in the United States who: (a) held the position of Financial Advisor at Merrill Lynch on 9-15-2008; (b) participated in one or more of the Plans; (c) voluntarily terminated employment (excluding retirement) at Merrill Lynch between 9-15-2008 and 6-30-2012 (the "Class Period") while holding the position of Financial Advisor at the time employment was terminated and had unvested awards in one or more of the Plans at the time of their terminations; (d) had 2008 Production Credits of \$500,000 or less; (e) did not sign and/or accept the original or amended ATP; (f) did not before the Notice Mailing Date, enter into a settlement agreement with one or</p>	4-26-2013	<p>For more information call or visit: 1-800 380-6343 www.chambersvmerrilllynchclaimsadministrator.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>more of the Defendants and/or the Releasees in which they released any claim related to an alleged voluntary termination of their employment with Merrill Lynch for "Good Reason" under one or more of the Plans following the Change in Control; and (g) did not adjudicate any of the claims described herein.</p>		
12-27-2012	11-CV-01014	(E.D. Va.)	<p>Landwehr v. AOL Inc. Plaintiffs allege that AOL made files containing some users' search queries available on the Internet. AOL said that the data was anonymous. The lawsuit claims, however, that: (1) some users' identities could be determined from the data, and (2) that AOL violated certain privacy and consumer protection laws by making it available on the Internet.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons residing in the United States or its territories whose internet search query data was made available for download from research.aol.com in 2006.</p>	5-17-2013	<p>For more information call or visit: 1-855 575-0127 www.AOLSearchDataSettlement.com</p>
12-28-2012	08-CV-04688	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>Herara v. Wyeth et al. Plaintiff alleged that Wyeth misled investors to expect that its pipeline drug Pristiq would be a major success when Defendants and others at Wyeth knew or should have known that Pristiq was unlikely to receive FDA approval. Plaintiff alleges that based on Defendants' misrepresentations the public was not aware that Wyeth stock was an imprudent and risky investment. Plaintiff further alleges that</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to: Stephen J. Fearon, Jr. Quitieri & Fearon LLP 32 East 57th Street 12th Floor New York, NY 10022 Thomas J. McKenna Gregory M. Egleston</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>because he and other Plan Participants invested in Wyeth stock through the Wyeth Common Stock Fund, their Retirement Accounts lost value after the FDA rejected approval of Pristiq.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who were participants in or beneficiaries of the Wyeth savings plan, the Wyeth Union savings plan, and the Wyeth savings plan - Puerto Rico, and whose accounts included investments in Wyeth common stock at any time between 1-31-2006 through 9-29-2008.</p>		<p>Gainey & McKenna 440 Park Avenue South 5th Floor New York, NY 10016</p>
12-28-2012	09-CV-00585	(D. Nev.)	<p>Carr, et al. v. International Game Technology ("IGT"), et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated ERISA and breached fiduciary duties by holding IGT stock inside the Plan when it allegedly was not a prudent investment for retirement purposes.</p> <p>Class Members are persons who were participants in or beneficiaries of the Plan at any time between 11-1-2007, through and including 4-23-2009, and whose individual Plan accounts included investments in the IGT Stock Fund at any time between 11-1-2007 through and including 4-23-2009.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write or visit:</p> <p>Thomas J. McKenna Gainey & McKenna 440 Park Avenue South 5th floor New York, NY 10016</p> <p>www.berdonclaims.com</p>
12-31-2012	07-CV-15474	(E.D. Mich.)	<p>David Date, et al. v. Sony Electronics, Inc. and ABC Appliance Inc.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Sony model KDS-R50XBR1 or KDS-R60XBR1 Televisions were not designed to accept a 1080p input signal as advertised.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Lance Raphael The Consumer Advocacy Center, P.C.</p>

Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in December, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			Class Members are all United States end user consumers who purchased, or received as a gift from the original retail purchaser, a KDS-R50XBR1 or KDS-R60XBR1 television.		180 West Washington Suite 700 Chicago, IL 60602