

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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
2-1-2012	09-MD-02086	(W.D. Mo.)	<p>In re: Pre-Filled Propane Tank Marketing & Sales Practices Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Blue Rhino, together with certain competitors, reduced the amount of propane gas in the pre-filled cylinders it sold to its customers without the reduced volume being visible from an examination of the propane container and/or failed to fill propane cylinders to proper levels and misrepresented or failed to disclose the actual net weight and level of propane in the cylinders to its customers.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased or exchanged one or more Blue Rhino propane gas cylinders, not for resale, in the U.S. between 6-15-2005 and (date not yet set), 2011.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Elizabeth A. Fegan Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP 820 North Blvd., Suite B Oak Park, IL 60301</p>
2-2-2012	09-CV-2079	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Hunter, et al. v. Citibank, N.A., et al. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants fail to complete Internal Revenue Code Section 1031 exchange transactions.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who were customers of 1031 Advance 132 LLC, 1031 Advance, Inc., 1031 TG Oak Harbor, LLC, AEC Exchange Company, LLC, Atlantic Exchange Company, Inc., Atlantic Exchange Company, LLC, Investment Exchange Group, LLC, National Exchange Accommodators LLC, National Exchange Services Q1, Ltd., NRC 1031 LLC, Real Estate Exchange Services,</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write or call:</p> <p>Hollister & Brace Robert L. Brace and Michael P. Denver P.O. Box 630 Santa Barbara, CA 93102</p> <p>(805) 963-6711</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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
			Inc., Rutherford Investment, LLC, Security 1031 Services, LLC, Shamrock Holdings Group, LLC, and/or The 1031 Tax Group, LLC, including any parents, subsidiaries or affiliates.		
2-2-2012	08-CV-10841	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>Public Employees' Retirement System of Mississippi, et al. v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants are in violation of the Securities Act (15 counts).</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired Merrill Lynch Alternative Note Asset Trust Series 2007-A3, 2007-AF1, 2007-F1, Merrill Lynch First Franklin Mortgage Loan Trust Series 2007-2, 2007-3, 2007-4, 2007-A, Merrill Lynch Mortgage Investors Trust Series 2006-MLN1, 2006-FM1, 2006-FF1, 2006-RM5, MLCC 2006-2, 2006-AHL1, 2006-RM3, 2006-WMC1, 2006-WMC2, 2006-A1, Ownit Mortgage Loan Trust Series 2006-2 and who were allegedly damaged thereby.</p>	3-21-2012	<p>For more information visit:</p> <p>www.MerrillLynchRMBSLitigation.com</p> <p>or</p> <p>www.blbglaw.com</p>
2-2-2012	11-CV-0412	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Kagan v. Wachovia Securities LLC</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants failed to provide notice to class members regarding another class action lawsuit ("APP Litigation") which reached a settlement. This action alleges that Defendants did not provide notice to class members and as a result, class members did not know about the</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information contact:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Brian S. Kabateck Richard L. Kellner Karen Liao Kabateck Brown Kellner LLP 644 S. Figueroa St. Los Angeles, Cal. 90017 </p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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>APP Litigation settlement and thus did not make a claim for monetary payment.</p> <p>Class Members are all; (i) who were beneficial owners between 8-28-1998 and 4-4-2001, inclusive, of APP Securities purchased between 8-28-1998 and 4-4-2001, inclusive, of which Defendants were record owners; (ii) who held accounts with Defendants between 11-30-2005 and 12-19-2005, inclusive; (iii) for whom Defendants were ordered in the APP Order to either provide a copy of the APP Notice or provide name and address information to the APP Settlement Claims Administrator pursuant to the APP Order and APP Notice; (iv) who were not provided a copy of the APP Notice and/or whose last known address information was not provided to the APP Settlement Claims Administrator; (v) who would have been entitled to a payment pursuant to the APP Settlement and (vi) who did not receive a payment pursuant to the APP settlement.</p>		<p>Or call: (213) 217-5000</p> <p>Or visit: www.kbklawyers.com</p>
2-2-2-12	06-md-1794	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>In re: Novartis Wage and Hour Litigation</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation ("NPC") (and other Defendants) denied its Sales Representatives and Sales Consultants overtime wages as required by federal law, the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA").</p> <p>Class Members are all who work or have worked for Novartis as a full-time active</p>	5-31-2012	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Novartis Claims Administrator c/o Rust Consulting, Inc. P.O. Box 1129 Minneapolis, MN 55440-1129</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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
			Sales Representative or Sales Consultant, including all non-manager job progressions from, and variation in, the Sales Representative and Sales Consultant titles in all NPC Sales Divisions or Business Units, including Mass Market, Specialty and Select Field Forces from 3-23-2000 to 4-7-2007.		
2-6-2012	06-CV-6128	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>In re: IMAX Corporation Securities Litigation</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants made false statements or used misleading financial reports which artificially inflated the price of IMAX stock during the U.S. Class Period and once certain financial information was disclosed, the price of IMAX's stock declined, thus injuring the Class.</p> <p>Class Members are all who purchased or otherwise acquired IMAX shares on the NASDAQ between 2-27-2003 and 7-20-2007 inclusive.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Lead Counsel Arthur N. Abbey, Karen E. Fisch and Richard B. Margolies, Abbey Spanier Rodd & Abrams, LLP 212 East 39th Street, New York, NY 10016</p>
2-6-2012	07-CV-04507	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>Silverman v. Motorola, Inc.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants are in violation of the Federal Securities Laws and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. The complaint allege that Motorola and certain of its executives issued false and misleading statements concerning Motorola's Third Generation, or "3G" handset that caused the price of Motorola securities to</p>	5-9-2012	<p>For more information visit:</p> <p>www.gilardi.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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>be artificially inflated.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased or otherwise acquired the publicly traded securities of Motorola, Inc. ("Motorola") from 7-19-2006 through 1-4-2007, inclusive.</p>		
2-8-2012	09-md-2107	(E.D. Pa.)	<p>In re: Budeprion XL Marketing and Sales Litigation</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that the BP XL product, in some instances (1) was less effective than the brand product; (2) resulted in side effects not experienced with the brand product; and (3) may have caused confusion in the marketplace because Defendants' BP XL prescribing insert used the trade name Budeprion XL instead of the generic name.</p> <p>Class Members are all individuals in the U.S. who, from 2006 to the present, purchased and/or paid (in whole or in part), for personal use and not for resale, Budeprion Hydrochloride XL (150 mg) and/or Budeprion XL (300-mg) manufactured by Impax.</p>	5-25-2012	<p>For more information call:</p> <p>1-866-503-9129</p>
2-8-2012	06-CV-06609	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Chavez v. Blue Sky Natural Beverage Co. et al</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' statements and activities were false and misleading and violated state and federal requirements for the labeling of beverages, because during the Class Period, canning authority over the beverages was exercised</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to Plaintiff's Counsel at:</p> <p>Blue Sky Settlement Gutride Saffier LLP P.O. Box 460823 San Francisco, CA 94146</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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 Corona, California (not from Santa Fe, New Mexico) by Hansen Beverage Company (not Blue Sky Beverage Company or Blue Sky Natural Beverage Company).</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased a Blue Sky Beverage in the United States between 5-16-2002 and 6-30-2006.</p>		
2-8-2012	11-CV-02940	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>Anita Cagle v. Anti-Aging Essentials Inc. Plaintiff allege that manufacturers and sellers of certain protein bars deceived consumers by printing misleading nutritional claims on the package labels of the bars. Specifically plaintiff alleges that the amounts of protein in the bars' labels were overstated and the sugar and carbohydrate claims on the labels were understated.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased "2:1 Peanut Butter Brownie"; "2:1 Cookies and Cream" and "2:1 Oatmeal" Protein Bars at General Nutrition Corporation from 2-2009 to 10-31-2010.</p>	6-5-2012	<p>For more information visit: http://www.cacd.uscourts.gov. then click on "CM/ECF" link and follow instructions</p>
2-9-2012	10-CV-01192	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Zeisel v. Diamond Foods, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Diamond mislabeled and misbranded its walnut products by making false and misleading statements on package labels and the company's website relating to the health benefits of walnut consumption.</p> <p>Class Members are all consumers who, for</p>	Not set yet	No information

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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
			personal or household use, purchased Diamond of California brand walnuts, which include, but are not limited to, Shelled, Halves, Chopped, Finely Diced, Chips, Nut Topping, and In-the-Shell Walnuts products in the United States from 3-22-2006 through [the date of preliminary approval of settlement].		
2-9-2012	11-CV-02472	(D. Kan.)	<p>Jones et al. v. Dickinson Theatres, Inc. et al. Plaintiffs allege that Defendant violated the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act by printing credit or debit card expiration dates on customer receipts.</p> <p>Class Members are all who used a major debit or credit card at any current Dickinson Theater between 6-4-2008 and (date not set), 2012, and was provided a receipt that contained the credit or debit card expiration date.</p>	Not set yet	No information
2-10-2012	10-CV-02990	(N.D. Ala.)	<p>Suzanne Goldberg, et al. v. Clayton College of Natural Health, Inc., et al. Plaintiffs allege that Clayton College was a for-profit holistic health college licensed by the State of Alabama. For many years Clayton College charged tuition in advance for entire programs, requiring students to pay in full for certificate, bachelor, master and PH.D., programs. In July 2010, after accepting substantial amounts of prepaid tuition, Clayton College abruptly</p>	2-15-2012	<p>For more information visit: www.ccnhclassction.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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>closed its doors and went out of business, making it impossible for students to complete their education at Clayton College.</p> <p>Class Members are all who were enrolled in but had not graduated or withdrawn from CCNH in a distance education program as of July 2010.</p>		
2-11-2012	07-CV-5944	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>In re: Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litigation</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants conspired to fix, raise, maintain or stabilize prices of CRT Products resulting in overcharges to consumers who bought CRT Products such as Televisions and Computer Monitors.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or businesses that indirectly bought in the U.S. (excluding claims under the Washington Unfair Business Practices and Consumer Protection Act) from 3-1-1995 through 11-25-2007, any CRT Product made by the Defendants. Both consumers and resellers are included in the Settlement.</p>	3-15-2012	<p>For more information visit: www.CRTsettlement.com</p>
2-14-2012	09-CV-1823	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Desiree Moore and Karen Jones v. Verizon Communications Inc.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Verizon placed charges from third-party companies on its bills and collected money from those charges, even though the customers had not knowingly authorized the charges. The lawsuit asks the Court to require Verizon to</p>	Not set yet	No information

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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>pay customers the money it collected for all third-party charges that the customers did not authorize.</p> <p>Class Members are all current and former Verizon landline customers who between 4-27-2005 to (date not set), 2012 were billed for third-party charges submitted to Verizon by Billing Concepts Inc. a/k/a Billing Services Group Clearing Solutions or BSG d/b/a ESBI, and HBS Billing Services Company (collectively, "Billing Concepts Inc."), The Billing Resource d/b/a Integretel ("The Billing Resource"), ILD Teleservices, Inc. ("ILD"), Transaction Clearing, LLC ("Transaction Clearing") and PaymentOne Corp., d/b/a PaymentOne or Ebillit ("PaymentOne").</p>		
2-15-2012	08-CV-1432	(D.N.J.)	<p>In re: Schering-Plough Corp. Enhance ERISA Litigation</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants breached their fiduciary duties to the Plans, participants and beneficiaries, in violation of §§1104 and 1105, by imprudently permitting the Plans to purchase and hold shares of Schering-Plough Stock where Defendants knew or should have know that Schering-Plough Stock was an imprudent investment of the Plans' assets due to Schering-Plough's financial condition throughout the Class Period.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who were</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP Attn: Derek Behnke 270 Madison Avenue New York, NY 10016</p> <p>Or call/visit:</p> <p>(212) 545-4600 behnke@whafh.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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 in and/or beneficiaries of the Schering-Plough employees' Savings Plan or the Schering-Plough Puerto Rico Employees' Retirement Savings Plan (the "Plan") from 4-19-2007 through 4-2-2008, inclusive (the "Class Period"), and whose accounts included investments in the Schering-Plough Common Stock Fund (the "Settlement Class").</p>		
2-16-2012	11-CV-5580	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>Fishbein et al. v. All Market Inc. d/b/a Vita Coco Plaintiffs allege that Vita Coco is in violation of state consumer protection laws, breach of express warranty, negligent misrepresentation, and unjust enrichment.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities in the U.S. who made retail purchases of Vita Coco Products between 8-10-2007 and the date in which the Court finally approves the Settlement (the "Settlement Class Period").</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Bernard Persky Hollis L. Salzman William V. Reiss Labaton Sucharow LLP 140 Broadway New York, NY 10005</p> <p>Or call: (212)907-0700</p>
2-16-2012	08-CV-574	(W.D. Tex.)	<p>In re: ArthroCare Corporation Securities Litigation Plaintiffs allege that ArthroCare and certain individual defendants are in violation of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act") and the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC"). It is also alleged, among other things, that those Defendants made public statements that were materially false and misleading with respect to the true nature of ArthroCare's business,</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit: www.arthrocaresecuritieslitigation.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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 failed to disclose numerous fraudulent and improper practices within the company, thus causing it to file materially false and misleading financial statements.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired the publicly traded securities of ArthroCare, and all persons or entities that purchased or otherwise acquired call options or who sold put options in ArthroCare common stock, between 12-11-2007 and 2-18-2009, inclusive, and who suffered a loss thereby.</p>		
2-16-2012	11-CV-3535	(E.D. Pa.)	<p>Clayton v. Orthovita, Inc., et al. Plaintiffs allege that Defendant Orthovita, Inc. ("Orthovita" or the "Company breached its fiduciary duties arising out of its ongoing efforts to sell the company to Stryker Corporation ("Stryker") pursuant to an unfair price, and unfair process, and through a materially misleading recommendation statement. Additionally, Plaintiff, individually, brings a claim against Defendant for violations of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act").</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities that held shares of common stock of Orthovita, Inc., either of record or as beneficial owners, at any time during the period beginning on and including 5-16-2011 through and including 6-28-2011.</p>	Not yet set	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Juan E. Monteverde Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP 369 Lexington Avenue 10th Floor New York, NY 10017</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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
2-16-2012	09-CV-00012	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>Menachem Maiman v. Gregory C. Talbott and Kevin McCarthy Plaintiffs allege that Defendants participated in a scheme to defraud investors by concealing PFF's unsafe lending practices and making false statements regarding, among other things: (1) PFF's lending and credit risk practices and the quality of PFF's loan portfolio; (2) PFF's financial disclosures, including revenues, earnings, assets, capital position, overall financial condition and its accounting for its Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses ("ALLL"); (3) PFF's purported compliance with regulatory requirements and guidance set forth by generally accepted accounting principles ("GAAP"), the SEC and the U.S. Office of Thrift Supervision ("OTS"); and (4) the overall impact of the housing and credit crises on PFF's business.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities who purchased or otherwise acquired the common stock of PFF Bancorp, Inc. ("PFF") beginning on 10-23-2006 through and including 4-30-2008.</p>	Not set yet	For more information visit: www.pacer.gov
2-16-2012	08-CV-2940	(N.D. Ga.)	<p>In re: Carter's, Inc. Securities Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Defendants are in violation of Federal Securities Laws. The Second Amended Complaint alleges that the Defendants violated the Security Exchange Act of 1934 by making alleged misstatements</p>	Not set yet	For more information write to: Labaton Sucharow LLP Jonathan Gardner 140 Broadway New York, N.Y. 10005

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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 omissions in Carter's publicly-filed financial statement.</p> <p>Class Members are, all persons who purchased the publicly traded securities of Carter's, Inc. during the period from 3-16-2005 through 11-10-2009, inclusive, and were allegedly damaged thereby.</p>		<p>Or call: (888) 219-6877</p> <p>Or visit: www.labaton.com or settlementquestions@labaton.com</p>
2-17-2012	10-CV-0198	(W.D. Wash.)	<p>Arthur et al. v. Sallie Mae, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Sallie Mae or another affiliate or subsidiary of SLM Corporation made automated calls to the Representative Plaintiffs and Class Members on their cellular telephones without their prior express consent. The Representative Plaintiffs claim that these practices violate the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA").</p> <p>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. Affiliates or subsidiaries of SLM Corporation that made such automated calls include Arrow Financial Services, LLC; Asset Performance Group, LLC; General Revenue Corporation; Pioneer Credit Recovery, Inc.; Sallie Mae, Inc.; SLM DE Corporation; SLM Financial Corporation; and Student Assistance Corporation.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit: www.ArthurTCPASettlement.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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
2-20-2012	09-CV-007799	(D. Del.)	<p>Local 731 1B of T Excavators and Pavers Pension Trust Fund et al. v. Swanson, et al. Plaintiffs allege that as of a result, of a shift away from print yellow pages the market price of RHD's common stock was artificially and improperly inflated between 10-26-2006 and 5-29-2009 inclusive.</p> <p>Class Members are all purchasers of RHD common stock during the Settlement Class Period, which is between 10-26-2006 and 5-29-2009, inclusive, including any and all of their respective successors-in-interest, successors, trustees, executors, administrators, estates, heirs, assigns and transferees, and any person or entity acting for or on behalf of such persons.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit: www.claimsinformation.com or: RHD Securities Litigation Claims Administrator c/o RSM McGladrey, Inc. P.O. Box 1387 Blue Bell, PA 19422</p>
2-20-2012	07-CV-00394	(N.D. Ala.)	<p>Marion Waters v. Cook's Pest Control, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Cook's discriminated against African Americans in terms of hiring. Cook's denies discriminatory practices but the parties agreed to resolve the issue through a class settlement subject to court approval.</p> <p>Class Members are all African Americans who applied at any Cook's Pest Control location at any time from 3-1-2005 through 1-27-2012.</p>	5-25-2012	<p>For more information write to: Claims Administrator P.O. Box 1854 Tallahassee, FL 32302-1854 Or call: 1-877-804-9742</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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
2-21-2012	10-MD-02188	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>In re: Apple iPhone 4 Products Liability Litigation Plaintiffs allege that the iPhone 4's signal quality attenuates when users handle the phone and that Apple engaged in misrepresentations regarding the iPhone 4.</p> <p>Class Members are all U.S. residents who are or were the original owners of an iPhone 4 as of 2-17-2012.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit: www.iphonejd.com or write to: Rick Nelson Class Member Relations Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd 655 West Broadway Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101</p>
2-23-2012	10-CV-2125	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Deno Milano v. Interstate Battery System of America, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants may have overcharged for a replacement battery under the terms of Interstate Batteries' pro-rata warranty.</p> <p>Class Members are all customers who purchased a replacement battery at an adjusted price under an Interstate Batteries pro-rata warranty.</p>	3-8-2012	<p>For more information visit: www.InterstateBatteriesSettlement.com</p>
2-23-2012	10-CV-20116	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>Wilson, et al. v. Farmers Group, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the Employee Retirement Income Security Act ("ERISA") by failing to consider payments made pursuant to the Bell judgment and settlement agreement as "Compensation" for purposes of determining the benefits due under the Plan.</p>	Not set yet	No information

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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 all participants in or beneficiaries of the Farmer Group, Inc. Employees' Profit Sharing Savings Plan Trust ("the Plan") who received overtime compensation from the Bell v. Farmers Insurance Exchange litigation for work performed before 8-31-2004, but whose Plan accounts were not credited for such compensation.</p>		
2-24-2012	11-CV-5677	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>Ludwig v. Pret A Manger (USA), Ltd. Plaintiffs allege that Pret violated the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") and certain state laws by unlawfully classifying employees who participated in Pret's Manager-in-Training Program during applicable statutory periods as exempt from receiving overtime pay.</p> <p>Class Members are all current or former employees of Pret A Manger (USA) Ltd. (Pret" or "Defendant") who participated in Pret's Manager-in-Training Program.</p>	Not set yet	No information
2-24-2012	11-CV-00318	(E.D. Tex.)	<p>Marilyn Frey v. Brinker Texas, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Brinker Texas violated the Fair and Accurate Credit Transaction Act by issuing receipts that printed more than the last five digits of the credit card account number and/or the expiration date of the debit cards exposed between 6-2-2009 and 6-2-2011.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Bruce Carlson Carlson Lynch, Ltd. 231 Melville Lane P.O. Box 367 Sewickley, PA 15143</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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 persons who, between 6-2-2009 and 6-2-2011, purchased food or beverage at Chili's #44 with a credit card or debit card.		Or call: 412-749-1677
2-24-2012	10-CV-414	(W.D. Wash.)	<p>In re: Cell Therapeutics, Inc. (CTI) Plaintiffs allege that Defendants are in violation of the Federal Securities Laws by using false and misleading statements in connection with the approval process for one of CTI's drugs, Pixantrone.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities who purchased the common stock of CTI securities between 3-25-2008 and 3-22-2010, both dates inclusive.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit or call:</p> <p>www.CellTherapeutics@gcginc.com</p> <p>877-519-0810</p>
2-29-2012	06-MD-1775	(E.D.N.Y.)	<p>In re: Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation Plaintiffs allege that numerous air cargo carriers and certain of their employees conspired to fix the prices of air cargo shipping services in violation of U.S. antitrust laws. British Air, Lan and Aerolinhas Brasileiras (Lan/ABSA), Malaysia Air, South African Air, Saudia, Emirates, El Al, Air Canada, and Salvator Sanfilippo have settled these claims and have agreed to pay over \$207 million to direct purchasers to, from, or within the United States.</p> <p>Class Members are all who purchased air</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit:</p> <p>www.aircargosettlement3.com</p> <p>or call:</p> <p>1-888-291-9655</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in February, 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
			cargo shipping services, directly from one or more defendants, for shipments to, from, or within the United States during the period from 1-1-2000 to 9-11-2006.		
2-29-2012	11-CV-920	(D. Md.)	<p>Wayne A. Bradshaw v. Hilco Receivables, LLC Shipman v. Hilco Receivables, LLC Plaintiffs allege Defendants violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act when each filed collection suits without a valid Debt Collection Agency license.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons in the State of Maryland, from 9-17-2006 through 5-19-2010 who were sued by the Defendants in connection with any effort to collect a debt in the courts of the State of Maryland.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or e-mail:</p> <p>Scott Borison Legg Law Firm, LLC 5500 Buckeystown Pike (Francis Scot Key Mall) Frederick, Md. 21703</p> <p>(301) 620-1016</p> <p>www.Hilco@legglaw.com</p>