

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May, 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
5-1-2012	10-CV-05345	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Aguilar, et al. v. Citizens Automobile Finance, Inc. and RBS Citizens, N.A. Plaintiffs allege that the Notices of Repossession sent by Defendants RBS Citizens, N.A. and Citizens Automobile Finance, Inc. ("CAFI" or "Citizens") from 5-20-2005 to 6-30-2011 regarding repossessed vehicles did not comply with the California Levering Automobile Sales Finance Act and that Citizens is not entitled to collect the deficiency if a deficiency balance remained after a subsequent sale of the vehicle.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons: 1) who purchased a motor vehicle and as part of that transaction, entered into an agreement allegedly subject to California's Rees-Levering Automobile Financing Act; 2) whose contract was assigned to Citizens; 3) whose motor vehicle was repossessed or voluntarily surrendered; 4) who were issued a notice of intent ("NOI") by CAFI or RBS Citizens from 5-20-2005 through 6-30-2011; and 5) against whose account a deficiency balance was assessed in any amount.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Bryan Kemnitzer Kemnitzer, Barron, & Krieg, LLP 445 Bush St., 6th Fl. San Francisco, CA 94108</p>
5-1-2012	07-CV-01292	(D. Ariz.)	<p>Johnson, et al. v. Arizona Hospital & Healthcare Association (AzHHA), et al. Plaintiffs allege that AzHHA and the hospital Defendants, through the AzHHA Registry Program, violated the antitrust laws, and other laws, by illegally agreeing to set and suppress the prices paid to outside staffing agencies for the work of temporary per diem and traveling nursing personnel, including RNs, LPNs, OR Techs, BHTs, and CNAs. The Lawsuit further alleges that AzHHA</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information call or write to:</p> <p>Allen Grunes Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP 1350 I St., N.W. Suite 510 Washington, DC 20005-3355 (202) 296-7353 www.bhfs.com</p> <p>David Balto</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May, 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 the other Defendants set the prices at artificially low levels, causing temporary nursing personnel to be paid less than they would have been paid otherwise.</p> <p>Class Members are any persons who, between 1-1-1997 and 9-12-2007, provided temporary per diem nurse services in Arizona for any Defendant or other hospitals that participated in the AzHHA Registry Program, and who were placed there through an outside nurse staffing agency.</p>		<p>Law Offices of David Balto 1350 I Street, N.W. Suite 850 Washington, DC 20005-3355 (202) 577-5424 www.dcantitrustlaw.com</p>
5-1-2012	10-CV-00425	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>Cohen, et al. v. Lowe's HIW, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that: 1) Defendant is liable for statutory penalties for an alleged failure to furnish accurate, itemized wage statements as required by California Labor Code (CLC); 2) Defendant is subject to liability for civil penalties under the CLC Attorneys General Act of 2004, based on the alleged failure to comply with CLC; 3) Defendant's reversal of Incentive Payments when customers returned items constituted unlawful wage deductions within the meaning of CLC; and 4) Defendant engaged in unlawful, unfair and/or fraudulent business practices within the meaning of California Business and Professions Code based on the aforementioned claims.</p> <p>Class Members are all current and former hourly employees employed by Lowe's HIW, Inc. in the State of California between 12-1-2007, through [Date of Preliminary Approval], who had commissions (i.e., Incentive Payments) reversed.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>David R. Markham R. Craig Clark James M. Treglio Clark & Markham LLP 600 B Street Suite 2130 San Diego CA, 92101</p> <p>Or:</p> <p>Walter Haines United Employees Law Group, PC 65 Pine Avenue, #312 Long Beach, CA 90802</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May, 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
5-2-2012	08-CV-04883	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>In re: Aftermarket Filters Antitrust Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Defendant engaged in an unlawful conspiracy to fix, raise, maintain and/or stabilize prices and allocate customers for certain light duty (i.e., automotive and light truck) oil, air and fuel filters for sale in the aftermarket.</p> <p>Class Members are: a) all persons who purchased the Filters in the United States directly from one or more of the Defendants from 3-1-1999 through 3-8-2012 ("Direct Purchasers"); b) all persons or entities in either the United States or in a specifically enumerated state who purchased Filters for their own use and not for resale from a Reseller Entity between 1-1-1999 and 3-8-2012 (as that term is defined in the Settlement Agreement) (the "Indirect Purchasers"); and c) all gas retailers in California who operate service stations and who indirectly purchased Filters for resale from the Defendant from 1-1-1999 through 3-8-2012 (the "Gas Retailers").</p>	10-4-2012	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Peter J. Kadzik Dickstein Shapiro LLP 1825 Eye Street, NW Washington, DC 20006</p>
5-2-2012	11-CV-1996 11-CV-03231 11-CV-2193	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Peterson, Swaney and Hurtado v. Lowe's HIW, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Lowe's violated California Civil Code §1747.08, which prohibits retailers from requesting and recording ZIP codes at the point of sale in conjunction with certain credit card transactions.</p> <p>Class Members are all purchasers of goods or services using a credit card from a Lowe's store in California during the period 2-23-2010 and [date] where a clerk requested a ZIP code from</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Gene J. Stonebarger STONEBARGER LAW, A.P.C. 75 Iron Point Circle Suite 145 Folsom, CA 95630</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May, 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
			the purchaser.		
5-4-2012	08-CV-02293	(W.D. Tenn.)	<p>Yost, et al. v. First Horizon National Co, et al. Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants breached their fiduciary duties under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA") by permitting Savings Plan assets to be invested in First Horizon stock and the First Funds. Plaintiffs claim that First Horizon stock was imprudently offered as a retirement investment between 1-1-2006 and 7-14-2008, and Defendants failed to provide complete and accurate information to participants concerning First Horizon stock and potential exposure to portfolio losses. Plaintiffs also claim the Defendants offered the First Funds in the Savings Plan between 5-9-2002 and 6-5-2006, not because the funds were prudent retirement investments, but rather because doing so generated fees and benefits to First Horizon and its affiliates.</p> <p>Class Members are all who participated in the First Horizon National Corporation Savings Plan between 5-9-2002 and 7-14-2008.</p>	Not set yet	For more information visit: www.FHNSavingsPlanSettlement.com
5-4-2012	07-CV-03359	(E.D.N.Y.)	<p>In re: Poll Corp. Securities Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Defendants knew that the public documents and statements issued or disseminated by the Defendants were materially false and misleading; knew that such statements or documents would be distributed to investing public; and knowingly and substantially participated or acquiesced in the issuance or disseminating of such statements or documents in</p>	Not set yet	For more information write to or call: Samuel H. Rodman David A. Rosenfeld Mario Alba, Jr. Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins LLP 58 South Service Road Suite 200

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May, 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
			violation of the federal securities laws. Class Members are all who purchased the securities of Pall between 3-22-2007 and 8-8-2007, inclusive and who were damaged thereby.		Melville, NY 11747 (671) 367-7100
5-7-2012	11-CV-00598	(N.D. Cal.)	Frank Pabst v. Genesco, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Genesco violated California law by requesting and recording personal identification information in conjunction with or during in-store credit card transactions in California. Class Members are individuals from whom Genesco requested and recorded personal identification information in conjunction with or during an in-store credit card transaction at any of its Johnston & Murphy, Journeys, Journeys Kitz, and/or Shi by Journeys California retail locations at any time from 3-3-2010, through preliminary hearing date.	Not set yet	For more information visit: www.GenescoClassSettlement.com
5-4-2012	09-CV-23235	(N.D. Cal.)	In re: Checking Account Overdraft Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Union Bank processed debit card transactions in order of highest to lowest dollar amount to maximize the number of overdraft fees assessed to its customers. Specifically, the lawsuit claims that, instead of declining certain transactions when an account had insufficient funds to cover a purchase, Union Bank authorized the transactions and then processed them in highest to lowest dollar amount order, which had the effect of increasing the number of overdraft fees the bank	9-13-2012	For more information visit: www.unionbankoverdraftsettlement.com

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May, 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>charged its customers.</p> <p>Class Members are: 1) account holders with Union Bank consumer checking and/or savings accounts accessible with a Union Bank debit card, at any time between 7-16-2005 and 8-13-2010; and 2) were charged one or more overdraft fees as a result of Union Bank's practice of posting debit card transactions from highest to lowest dollar amount.</p>		
5-4-2012	08-CV-6762	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>In re: Lehman Brothers Mortgage-Backed Securities Litigation</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege claims regarding the alleged systematic disregard of securities guidelines by originators of mortgage loans underlying the mortgage pass-through certificates but dismissing certain claims for lack of standing because Plaintiffs had not purchased certificates in all ninety-four offerings identified in the Amended Complaint. As a result, the motion to dismiss order sustained claims as to nine Offerings, LXS 2005-5N, LXS 2005-7N, LXS 2005-6, LXS 2006-2N, LXS 2006-14N, LXS 2006-GP2, GMFT 2006-AR4, GMFT 2006-AR5 and SARM 2006-1 (the "Plaintiff Offerings").</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities who purchased or otherwise acquired mortgage pass-through certificates pursuant or traceable to SASCO's 8-16-2005 Registration Statement or 5-10-2006 Registration Statement, and the accompanying prospectuses and prospectus supplements in the following 17 offerings and who were damaged thereby: the LXS 2005-5N offering, LXS 2005-7N offering, LXS 2005-6</p>	6-7-2012	<p>For more information write or visit:</p> <p>COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL PLLC Steven J. Toll 1100 New York Avenue N.W. Suite 500 Washington, D.C. 20005</p> <p>www.LehmanMBSSettlement.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May, 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>offering, LXS 2005-8 offering, LXS 2006-2N offering, LXS 2006-14N offering, LXS 2006-16N offering, LXS 2006-GP2 offering, GMFT 2006-AR4 offering, GMFT 2006-AR5 offering, SARM 2006-1 offering, SARM 2006-4 offering, SARM 2007-6 offering, SASCO 2007-BC1 offering, SASCO 2007-EQ1 offering, SASCO 2007-OSI offering and FFMLT 2006-FFB offering (collectively, the "Certificates").</p>		
5-10-2012	09-CV-02305	(W.D. Tenn.)	<p>Robert Fabian, et al. v. Fulmer Helmets, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Fulmer made fraudulent misrepresentations, made negligent misrepresentations, breached the implied warranty of merchantability, breached the implied warranty of fitness for a particular purpose, and was unjustly enriched by its sale and marketing AF-50 Helmets as "DOT approved" on labels affixed to the helmets, in marketing materials, on Fulmer's website, and in its catalogues. Plaintiffs allege that, in fact, the AF-50 Helmets did not meet Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 281, 49 C.F.R. § 571.218, of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.</p> <p>Class Members are all purchasers of an AF-50 Helmet, in any size, from 8-20-2002, through 3-30-2012.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to or call:</p> <p>J. Gerard Stranch, IV James G. Stranch, III Branstetter, Stranch & Jennings, PLLC 227 Second Avenue North Fourth Floor Nashville, TN 37201-163</p> <p>(615) 254-8801</p>
5-14-2012	10-CV-05810	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>Shields, et al. v. Walt Disney Parks and Resorts, U.S. Inc., et al. Plaintiffs allege individuals with visual impairments were denied equal access to or enjoyment of the Disney theme parks in California and Florida (the "Disney Parks").</p>	8-3-2012	<p>For more information write or visit:</p> <p>Andy Dogali Forizs & Dogali, P.A. 4301 Anchor Plaza Pkwy.</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May, 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 individuals with visual impairments who: (a) have a disability, as that term is defined in 42 U.S.C. § 12102, and (b) have been or will be unable to gain equal access to or enjoyment of one or more of the websites owned or operated by Disney such as www.disney.go.com, www.disneyland.com, www.disneyworld.com and www.disneycruise.com as a result of their visual disability.</p>		<p>Suite 300 Tampa, Florida 33634</p> <p>www.disney.settlement@forizs-dogali.com</p>
5-17-2012	10-CV-09989	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>White, et al. v. Your Baby Can, LLC, et al. Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants made false claims in their advertising for the Your Baby Can Read! products.</p> <p>Class Members are all who purchased a Your Baby Can Read! product between 11-18-2006 and 5-7-2012.</p>	1-21-2013	<p>For more information call or visit:</p> <p>1-866-683-8799</p> <p>www.YourBabyCanReadSettlement.com</p>
5-18-2012	09-CV-00780	(D.D.C.)	<p>Mishkin v. Zynex, Inc., et al. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants made false and misleading statements, assert claims for violations of the federal securities laws, and seek compensatory damages and other relief. The operative complaint is primarily based upon allegations of wrongdoing in connection with the Company's announcement of its intention to restate previously issued financial statements for the first three fiscal quarters.</p> <p>The Class includes all persons who purchased Zynex common stock between 5-21-2008 and 3-31-2009, inclusive.</p>	9-14-2012	<p>For more information call: 1-888-308-0176</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May, 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
5-18-2012	07-CV-8538	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>Frudenberg v. E*TRADE Financial Corp., et al. Plaintiffs allege that E*TRADE securities and prices were artificially inflated during the Settlement Class Period.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired securities from E*TRADE Financial corporation 4-19-2006 through 11-9-2007.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information call or visit:</p> <p>1-800-903-8296</p> <p>eClaim@gcginc.com</p>
5-23-2012	12-CV-00297	(E.D.N.Y.)	<p>Sterling v. Stratfor Enterprises, LLC, et al. Plaintiffs allege that Stratfor failed to take action prior to and after the hack of Stratfor's servers and improper actions or omissions contributed to the theft of customers' personal information and credit card numbers.</p> <p>Class Members are all individuals who were current or former subscribers to the Stratfor Service as of 12-24-2011.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write or email:</p> <p>Hunter J. Shkolnik Adam J. Gana Napoli Bern Ripka Shkolnik, LLP 350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 7413 New York, NY 10118</p> <p>Hunter@napolibern.com</p> <p>agana@napolibern.com</p>
5-23-2012	10-CV-5336	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Hays, et al. v. Commonwealth Land Title Insurance Co., et al. Plaintiffs allege Defendants breached their fiduciary duties, conspired to commit fraud, mismanaged investors' funds, and perpetrated a ponzi scheme to defraud investors instead of properly managing 1031 Qualified Intermediary Escrow funds.</p> <p>Class Members one class and two subclasses are established as follows:</p>	Not set yet	No information

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May, 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 is comprised of every comingled Exchanger who entrusted their 1031 Exchange funds to LandAmerica 1031 Exchange Services, Inc. (LES) after 2-11-2008 and have been denied access to any of those exchange funds.</p> <p>Subclasses are: The Commonwealth Land Title Insurance Company (CLITC) Subclass is composed of every comingled Exchanger who was referred to LES by CLITC or their subsidiaries and entrusted their 1031 Exchange Funds to Land America 1031 Exchange Services, Inc. after 2-11-2008 and who have been denied access to any of those exchange funds.</p> <p>The proposed LTIC subclass is defined as follows: every comingled Exchanger who was referred to LES by LTIC or their subsidiaries and entrusted their 1031 Exchange Funds to Land America 1031 Exchange Services, Inc. after 2/11/2008 and who have been denied access to any of those Exchange Funds.</p>		
5-23-2012	07-CV-02351	(D. Colo.)	<p>In Re: Crocs, Inc., Securities Litigation Plaintiffs allege that between 4-2-2007 and 4-14-2008, inclusive, the settling Defendants made certain materially false and misleading statements about Crocs' financial results, internal controls, and inventory accounting.</p> <p>Class Members are all who purchased or acquired Crocs, Inc., publicly traded securities between 4-2-2007 and 4-14-2008, inclusive.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information call, call or visit:</p> <p>(212) 501-9000</p> <p>Brower Piven A Professional Corp. 488 Madison Ave 8th Floor New York, NY 10022 www.gcqinc.com/cases/CrocsSecuritiesLitigation</p>
5-28-2012	09-CV-0154	(E.D.N.Y.)	Bayer Corp. Combination Aspirin Products	Not set	For more information

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May, 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>Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Bayer overcharged consumers for Bayer® Aspirin With Heart Advantage and Bayer® Women’s Low-Dose Aspirin + Calcium (“Combination Aspirin Products”) in that these products should not have been sold, because products were not FDA approved, could not provide the advertised health benefits and were inappropriate for long-term use.</p> <p>Class Members are all purchasers of either Bayer® Aspirin With Heart Advantage between 1-1-2008 and the preliminary hearing date or Bayer® Women’s Low Dose Aspirin + Calcium between 1-1-2000 and the preliminary hearing date in the U.S. for personal, family or household use.</p>	yet	<p>visit, call or write: www.bayercombinationaspirinsettlement.com 1-877-257-5766 Bayer Combination Aspirin Litigation Settlement, c/o Gilardi & Co. LLC. P.O. Box 808061 Petaluma, CA 94975-8061</p>
5-29-2012	09-CV-05337	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Theodore Kagan, et al. v. Wachovia Securities, L.L.C., et al Plaintiffs allege that Defendants, records indicate that it is possible that a member of the Asia Pulp & Paper (“APP”) class by virtue of purchases of the APP securities through accounts held with Defendants or their predecessors but may not have received notice of the APP settlement. Therefore some uninformed account holders may have been entitled to monetary payments from the settlement. Defendants have agreed to pay present and former account holders for whom Defendants were required to provide notice of the APP settlement, and who would have received a payment in the APP settlement had they submitted a Proof of Claim form in the APP litigation entitling them to payment.</p> <p>Class Members are all purchasers or persons who</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or visit: Brian S. Kabateck Richard L. Kellner Evan M. Zucker Kabateck Brown Kellner LLP 644 S. Figueroa St. Los Angeles, Cal. 90017 (213) 217-5000 www.kbklawyers.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May, 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>acquired any of the publicly-traded securities of Asia Pulp & Paper Company Ltd. ("APP") and its subsidiaries as listed herein (the "APP Instruments") during the period between 8-28-1998 and 4-4-2001, and did not previously receive a payment from a settlement in a class action titled In re: Asia Pulp & Paper Securities Litigation, Consolidated Civil Action No. 01-CV-7351 (JES) (S.D.N.Y.) (the "AP Settlement"), and had an account with any of the brokerage firms or their subsidiaries listed as "Defendants" (please see more information) during the period of 11-30 to 12-19-2005.</p>		
5-30-2012	06-CV-3523	(D. Mass.)	<p>Burch v. Qwest Corporation et. al. Plaintiffs allege that Qwest did not pay certain wages allegedly due to Sales Consultant and Sales and Service Consultants (collectively, "Consultants") under the federal Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") and Minnesota, Colorado, Oregon and Washington state laws. The Court certified a collective action for the FLSA claims, and state class actions for the state claims that Consultants were not paid overtime associated with logging onto and off of computer programs at the beginning and end of work shifts.</p> <p>Class Members consist of Consultants who are or were employed in one or more of the following states during the time periods listed below and who performed the activities of booting up their computers and logging onto their computer programs before the state of their shifts and/or the activities of logging out of their computer programs and/or shutting down their computers</p>	9-14-2012	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Nichols Kaster, PLLP c/o Reena I. Desai 4600 IDS Center 80 South 8th Street Minneapolis, MN 55402</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May, 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>after the end of their shifts. The time periods for the Settlement Class are: Minnesota: 8-30-2003 to 3-21-2012 Oregon: 4-10-2005 to 3-21-12 Colorado: 4-1-2005 to 3-21-2012 Washington: 12-17-2004 to 3-21-2012</p>		
5-31-2012	06-MD-1738	(E.D.N.Y.)	<p>In Re: Vitamin C Antitrust Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Vitamin C manufacturers conspired to fix and raise prices.</p> <p>Class Members are broken down in three groups: <u>Direct Purchaser Damages Class</u> are persons who: 1) purchased vitamin C, 2) for delivery in the U.S., 3) directly from a Defendant (except Northeast Pharmaceutical) or another Chinese manufacture of vitamin C, 4) between 12-1-2001 and 6-30-2006, and 5) without a contract, or with a contract that did not include an arbitration clause.</p> <p><u>Indirect Purchaser Damages Class</u> are persons who: 1) currently live in and purchased capsules or tablets containing vitamin C in Ariz., Cal., D.C., Fla., Iowa, Kan., Me., Mass., Mich., Minn., Neb., Nev., NM., N.Y., N.C., N.D., S.D., Tenn., Vt., W.V., or Wis., 2) between 12-1-2001 and 6-30-2006, and 3) for use or consumption and not for resale.</p> <p><u>Injunction Class</u> are person who: 1) purchased vitamin C manufactured by a Defendant, or products from any company manufactured by Defendant, 2) purchased directly from a Defendant or from any other company, 3)</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit: www.vitaminCantitrust.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May, 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
			purchased for delivery in the U.S., 4) from 12-1-2001 to the present, 5) without a contract, or under a contract without an arbitration clause.		
5-31-2012	09-CV-02311	(D.D.C.)	<p>Mildred Werts v. Midland Funding, LLC, et al., Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, ("FDCPA") and the District of Columbia Consumer Protection Procedures Act § 28-3901, et seq. ("CPPA") by instituting a legal action in a District of Columbia court to collect on a debt alleged to be more than three years from the date of default.</p> <p>Class Members have been identified as 107 persons, who, beginning three years prior to the filing of the Complaint, which was filed 12-7-2009 in the Litigation, and continuing through the date of resolution of this case, had a legal action instituted against them by the law firm Mann Bracken, LLP on behalf of Midland Funding, LLC, in a District of Columbia court to collect on a debt more than three years from the date of default (the "Settlement Class").</p>	5-29-2012	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Philip S. Friedman Friedman Law Offices, PLLC 2401 Penn., Ave, NW Suite 410 Washington, DC 20049</p>