| **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name**  **Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4-1-2016** | **12-CV-1413** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Brian Otero v. Thomas J. Dart and Cook County, Illinois**  The Lawsuit challenges the Sheriff’s policy or practice of detaining male inmates in an unreasonable and unconstitutional manner following a trial or other court appearance where they are found not guilty or otherwise had the charges against them dismissed. The Lawsuit also brought an Equal Protection claim based on the Sheriff’s practice of treating male inmates differently than similarly situated female inmates who were found not guilty or otherwise had the charges against them dismissed. The Class is described as: all male inmates who while being detained by the Cook County Sheriff’s Office were found not guilty, were acquitted, or had charges brought against them dismissed, and the Sheriff’s Office no longer had any legal right to detain. The Class Period is from 4-27-2010 to present. | **Not set yet** | Prepared by Brenda Berkley  **For more information write to:**  **Myron M. Cherry**  **Jacie C. Zolna**  **Myron M. Cherry &**  **Associates, LLC**  **30 North LaSalle Street**  **Suite 2300**  **Chicago, IL 60602** |
| **4-1-2016** | **14-CV-02032** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Antonio Aceves Jr. and Jesse Alvarez v. Autozone, Inc.**  Employee-plaintiff alleges that Defendant acquired and used various types of background check reports (consumer reports, investigative consumer reports and consumer credit reports) on applicants without complying with the disclosure and authorization requirements of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (“FCRA”) and California law. The Amended Complaint adds the allegation that Defendant acquired and used various types of background check reports (consumer reports, investigative consumer reports and consumer credit reports) on current employees without providing certain required pre-adverse action and/or adverse action notices. The Class Period is from 9-30-2012 to date of Preliminary Approval. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Jordan L. Lurie**  **Robert K. Friedl**  **Tarek H. Zhody**  **Cody R. Padgett**  **Capstone Law APC**  **1840 Century Park East**  **Suite 450**  **Los Angeles, CA 90067**  **310 556-4811 (Ph.)**  **310 943-0396 (Fax)** |
| **4-1-2016** | **15-CV-02069** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Ravi Motwani v. Marina District Development Corporation LLC**  Plaintiff alleges that vouchers issued by the Borgata Hotel, Casino & Spa (Atlantic City, NJ) to certain favored customers (“Rewards Members”) offering “Unlimited Free Parking” at the casino. The plaintiff alleges that these vouchers were misleading because they could not be used more than once on the same day. While this condition was stated on the face of the vouchers, the plaintiff alleges that the print was too small to be read by the average consumer. Plaintiff clams that Defendant improperly required all to pay a $5 parking fee and was not able to use the voucher a second time in the same 24 hours. The Class Period is from 7-1-2009 to 12-31-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **Bruce H. Nagel**  **Randee M. Matloff**  **Nagel Rice LLP**  **103 Eisenhower Parkway**  **Roseland, NJ 07068** |
| **4-1-2016** | **15-CV-00494** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **Brown, et al. v. Transurban (USA), Inc., et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that Transurban operates certain toll road lanes on Interstate 495 and Interstate 95 in Virginia, called the 495  Express Lanes and 95 Express Lanes, respectively, and the Express Lanes collectively. Tolls on these lanes are collected via E-ZPass, an electronic toll collection system. When someone does not pay a toll on the Express Lanes, Transurban may charge an administrative fee, which may escalate over time, and Transurban may eventually seek a civil penalty in court. The Lawsuit alleged that the Defendants enforced toll violations on the Express Lanes in an unlawful manner. The Class will include any Person who had one or more E-ZPass accounts at the time such Person incurred one or more alleged Toll Violation(s) on the Express Lanes and paid $100  or more to Transurban (or one of its affiliates) or Law Enforcement Systems, Inc. in Administrative Fees and/or Civil Penalties arising from the alleged Toll Violation(s), that, at the time of payment, were at the Collections Stage or Court Stage, and made such payment at any time from the inception of the Express Lanes to 3-1-2016. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Hausfeld LLP**  **1700 K Street, NW Suite 650**  **Washington, DC 20006**  **Boies, Schiller &**  **Flexner LLP, Tycko**  **& Zavareei LLP**  **5301 Wisconsin Ave. NW**  **Washington, DC 20015**  **DiMuro Ginsberg**  **1101 King Street, Suite 610**  **Alexandria, VA 22314** |
| **4-7-2016** | **12-CV-2450** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **In re: Groupon Securities Litigation**  The Amended Complaint asserts claims arising under Sections 11, 12 and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”) related to alleged misrepresentations and omissions made in the registration statement and prospectus issued in connection with Groupon’s 11-4-2011 initial public offering (“IPO”), and under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) related to alleged misrepresentations and omissions between 2-9-2012 and 3-30-2012. The Class is described as all persons or entities who purchased or acquired shares of Groupon’s Class A common stock, par value $0.0001 per share (the “Common Stock”), in or traceable to Groupon’s Initial Public Offering between 11-4-2011 and 3-30-2012, both dates inclusive (“the Class Period”), and were or may have been damaged thereby, and all such persons or entities who purchased or acquired shares of Common Stock between 2-9-2012 and 3-30-2012, both dates inclusive (“the Subclass Period”). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:**  **Joshua B. Silverman**  **Pomerantz LLP**  **10 South LaSalle St. Suite 3505**  **Chicago, IL 60603**  [**jbsilverman@pomlaw.com**](mailto:jbsilverman@pomlaw.com) |
| **4-8-2016** | **12-CV-00376** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Kim Allen, et al. v. Similasan Corporation**  Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that labeling and  marketing representations on homeopathic over-the-counter drugs manufactured or distributed by  Similasan Corporation were false or deceptive. The Class is described as all who purchased any over-the-counter Similasan homeopathic drug, in all sizes and package iterations, for personal or household use from 2-10-2008 to date of Preliminary Approval. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Ronald A. Marron**  **Law Offices of**  **Ronald A. Marron, APLC**  **651 Arroyo Drive**  **San Diego, CA 92103**  **619 696-9006 (Ph.)** |
| **4-8-2016** | **14-CV-0367** | **(D. Or.)** | **In re: Galena Biopharma, Inc. Securities Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Galena Biopharma, Inc., Mark J. Ahn, Steven Kriegsman, Richard Chin, Stephen S. Galliker, Rudolph Nisi, Sanford J. Hillsberg, Ryan Dunlap, Mark Schwartz and Remy Bernarda (collectively the “Settling Defendants”),**  This action alleges violations of the Federal Securities Laws (specifically Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. § 240.10b-5)) against all Defendants. Plaintiffs allege that, during the Class Period, Galena’s stock price was artificially inflated as a result of a series of articles and statements that were part of a pump and dump scheme. Beginning 7-2013, Galena paid promoters – Non-Settling Defendants Dream Team Group LLC, Thomas Mayer, Michael McCarthy, Lidingo Holdings LLC, and Kamilla Bjorlin – to tout Galena’s stock. Lead Plaintiffs further contend that Settling Defendants participated in the scheme knowing representations by the Non-Settling Defendants to be false or misleading, or recklessly disregarding their false or misleading natures, and investors suffered injury as a result of the alleged inflation and subsequent disclosure thereof. The Class Period is from 8-6-2013 to 5-14-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **The Rosen Law Firm, P.A.**  **275 Madison Avenue**  **34th Floor**  **New York, NY 10016** |
| **4-8-2016** | **13-CV-00513** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Jimmy Lyons, et al. v. Litton Loan Servicing LP**  Plaintiffs allege that when a borrower was required to have insurance for property pursuant to a residential mortgage, and evidence of acceptable coverage was not provided (for example, when the insurance policy did not exist or had lapsed), Litton would place insurance in a manner that enabled it to obtain an unauthorized benefit. The Plaintiffs also allege that the way in which a lender-placed hazard, flood, flood gap, or wind insurance policy (“LPI”) was obtained and placed caused the LPI charges and the amount of coverage to be excessive. The Class Period is from 1-1-2006 to date of Preliminary Approval. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Peter A. Muhic**  **Kessler Topaz Meltzer &**  **Check, LLP**  **280 King of Prussia Road**  **Radnor, PA 19087**  **Shanon J. Carson**  **Berger & Montague, P.C.**  **1622 Locust Street**  **Philadelphia, PA 19103** |
| **4-11-2016** | **12-MD-02380** | **(M.D. Pa.)** | **In re: Shop-Vac Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants Shop-Vac Corporation and Lowe’s Home Centers, LLC misrepresented the horsepower tank capacity of Shop-Vac brand wet/dry vacuums. The Class is described as all who: (1) purchased, (2) received as a gift, or (3) acquired possession through other lawful means a Shop-Vac brand wet/dry vacuum between 1-1-2006 to date of Preliminary Approval. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Elizabeth Goldstein**  **Dilworth Paxson LLP**  **Penn National Insurance**  **Plaza**  **2 North 2nd Street**  **Suite 1101**  **Harrisburg, PA 17101** |
| **4-11-2016** | **14-CV-00682** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **In re: Genworth Financial, Inc. Securities Litigation**  Securities-plaintiffs assert claims against all Defendants under Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, and against Thomas J. McInerney and Martin P. Klein under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. Among other things, the Complaint alleged that, starting on 10-30-2013, the first day of the Settlement Class Period, Defendants made materially false and misleading statements about Genworth’s long-term care insurance business and reserves related thereto. The Complaint further alleged that the prices of Genworth securities were artificially inflated as a result of Defendant’s allegedly false and misleading statements, and declined when the alleged truth was revealed through a series of public disclosures beginning on 7-30-2014 and ending on 11-5-2014, the last day of the Settlement Class Period. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **Bernstein Litowitz Berger**  **& Grossmann LLP**  **David R. Stickney**  **12481 High Bluff Drive Suite 300**  **San Diego, CA 92130**  **Bleichmar Fonti & Auld**  **LLP**  **Joseph A. Fonti**  **7 Times Square**  **27th Floor**  **New York, NY 10036** |
| **4-11-2016** | **14-cv-04062** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Animation Workers Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Blue Sky Studios, Inc., DreamWorks Animation SKG, Inc., Two Pic MC LLC f/k/a Image Movers Digital LLC, Lucasfilm, Ltd., LLC, Pixar, Sony Pictures Animation, Inc., Sony Pictures Imageworks, Inc., and The Walt Disney Company**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1, California’s Cartwright Act, Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16720, et seq., and California’s Unfair Competition Law, Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq., by conspiring to limit competition for employees, primarily through alleged agreements among certain Defendants not to cold call each other’s employees, the alleged sharing of compensation information, and alleged agreements upon compensation ranges. The class consists of all persons who worked at any time from 2004 to the present in technical, artistic, creative and/or research and development positions for Pixar, Lucasfilm, DreamWorks Animation, Walt Disney Animation Studios, Walt Disney Feature Animation, Digital Domain, ImageMovers Digital, Sony Pictures Animation or Sony Pictures Imageworks in the United States. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Shana E. Scarlett**  **715 Hearst Avenue**  **Suite 202**  **Berkeley, CA 94710**  **510 725-3000 (Ph.)**  **510 725-3001 (Fax)**  [**jefff@hbsslaw.com**](mailto:jefff@hbsslaw.com)  [**shanas@hbsslaw.com**](mailto:shanas@hbsslaw.com)  **Steve W. Berman**  **HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL**  **SHAPIRO LLP**  **1918 Eighth Avenue**  **Suite 3300**  **Seattle, WA 98101**  **206 623-7292 (Ph.)**  **206 623-0594 (Fax)**  [**steve@hbsslaw.com**](mailto:steve@hbsslaw.com) |
| **4-11-2016** | **13-CV-1663** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Edward L. Davis v. Kristin M. Proud, as Acting Commissioner of the Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance of the New York State Department of Family Assistance, and Tom Vilsack, as Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture**  This lawsuit involves certain claims pertaining to the calculation of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits owed to individuals residing in New York (outside of New York City) in a group home receiving both federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and SNAP benefits. The Class Period is from 1-1-2005 to 9-30-2008. | **7-26-2016** | **For more inforamtion write or call:**  **John F.Castellano**  **Co-counsel for**  **Davis Plaintiff Class**  **Mercy Advocacy Program**  **Mercy Haven, Inc.**  **859 Connetquot Avenue**  **Islip Terrace, NY 11752**  **631 581-7100 (Ph.)** |
| **4-11-2016** | **15-CV-00606** | **(S.D. Ind.)** | **Fosnight v. Convergent Outsourcing, Inc. and Jefferson Capital Systems, LLC**  Consumer-plaintiff alleges that a collection letter sent by Defendant Convergent Outsourcing, on behalf of Defendant Jefferson Capital Systems, failed to advise that disputes as to the validity of the debt had to be in writing to protect Plaintiff’s right to obtain validation of the debt. Plaintiff’s lawsuit alleges that Defendants violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. The Class Period is from 4-15-2014 to present. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **David J. Philipps**  **Philipps & Philipps, Ltd.**  **9760 S. Roberts Road**  **Suite One**  **Palos Hills, IL 60465** |
| **4-15-2016** | **13-MD-02478** | **(D. Conn.)** | **In re: Convergent Telephone Consumer Protection Act Litigation**  **Re Defendant: Convergent Outsourcing, Inc.**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that certain Convergent telephone calls violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq. (the “TCPA”). The Class is described as all persons called by Convergent on a cellular telephone who: (a) had been reported to Convergent as a wrong number; (b) previously requested Convergent not to call such telephone number; (c) were called after providing to Convergent notice of bankruptcy; (d) were called after entry by Convergent of an internal attorney handling code or (e) were called on a cell number obtained via third party skip tracing, on or after 10-26-2008 through and including the date of entry of the Preliminary Approval Order. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **Keith Keogh**  **Keogh Law, Ltd.**  **55 Monroe Street**  **Suite 3390**  **Chicago, IL 60603** |
| **4-15-2016** | **14-CV-05191** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Shawn Heaton and Anna Ahlborn, et al. v. Socialfinance, Inc. and SoFi Lending Corp.**  Plaintiffs allege that: (1) SoFi’s website confused and/or misled consumers about whether SoFi would ever do “hard” credit inquiries; and (2) SoFi obtained credit reports on consumers on a “hard inquiry” basis when it lacked the legal right to do so. The Class Period is from 11-20-2013 to 8-13-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **E. Michelle Drake**  **Berger & Montague, P.C.**  **43 Main Street SE**  **Suite 505**  **Minneapolis, MN 55414** |
| **4-15-2016** | **15-CV-01399** | **(E.D. La.)** | **Jefferson Radiation Oncology, LLC v. Advance Care Scripts, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that Advance Care Scripts, Inc. (“ACS”) violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) by sending via facsimile transmission, advertisements that did not comply with the TCPA’s opt-out notice requirements. The Faxes promoted products sold, or services provided, by ACS. The Class Period is from 4-29-2011 to 2-19-2016. | **8-10-2016** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **George Recile**  **One Galleria Blvd.**  **Suite 1100**  **Metairie, LA 70001** |
| **4-15-2016** | **13-CV-21158** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Barba, et al. v. Shire U.S., Inc. and Shire LLC**  Plaintiffs claim that Shire delayed and lessened the availability of less expensive generic versions of Adderall XR® by: (1) filing false patent litigations; (2) filing a false  Citizens Petition to delay the Food and Drug Administration’s approval of generic versions; (3) entering into financial agreements with generic drug manufacturers; (4) creating a shortage of generic versions by supplying less than agreed to; and (5) paying higher rebates to managed care organizations that agreed to the preferred placement of brand Adderall  XR® instead of generic versions. The settlement includes all persons who purchased and paid for some or all of the purchase price Adderall XR® (brand name only, for personal or household use) from 1-1-2007 to the date of Preliminary Approval in the District of Columbia, Alabama, Arizona, California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, or Wisconsin (the “Territory”). | **11-9-2016** | **For more information write to:**  **Conlee S. Whiteley**  **KANNER & WHITELEY, LLC**  **701 Camp Street**  **New Orleans, LA 70130** |
| **4-15-2016** | **13-MD-02420** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litigation**  The lawsuit alleges that Defendants and co-conspirators conspired to raise and fix the prices of Li-Ion Cells for over ten years, resulting in overcharges to indirect purchasers of Li-Ion Batteries and Li-Ion Products. The complaint describes how the Defendants and co-conspirators allegedly violated the U.S. and state antitrust, unfair completion, and consumer protection laws by agreeing to fix prices and restrict output of Li-Ion Cells by, among other things, face-to-face meetings and other communications, customer allocation, and the use of trade associations. The Class Period is from 1-1-2000 to 5-31-2011. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit or call:**  [**www.batteriesconsumerlitigation.com**](http://www.batteriesconsumerlitigation.com)    **1 800 584-2211 (Ph.)** |
| **4-18-2016** | **08-CV-5322** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Adam Bergman, Kendrick Patterson, Michael Attianese, Andrea Levy, Daryl Yeakle, and Raymond R. Plante v. Thelen LLP**  Employee-plaintiffs seek damages for Defendant’s failure to provide notification as required by the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act, 29 U.S.C. Section 2101 et seq. (the “Federal WARN Act”) and California Relocations, Terminations and Mass Layoffs Act, Cal. Labor Code Section 1400 et seq. (the “California WARN Act”), and to recover damages for accrued but unused vacation time due and owing at the time their Thelen employment was involuntarily terminated on or about 10-30-2008, pursuant to applicable state laws governing compensation for unpaid accrued leave. The Class is described as: All former employees of Thelen, LLP, who were involuntarily terminated by Thelen, LLP, on or about 11-30-2008 or who were not compensated for accrued but unused vacation time in accordance with applicable state law. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **Craig Collins and**  **Steven Blum**  **Blum, Blum Collins LLP**  **707 Wilshire Blvd**  **48th Floor**  **Los Angeles, CA 90017** |
| **4-21-2016** | **14-CV-3722** | **(D.N.J.)** | **In re: Caterpillar, Inc., C13 and C15 Engine Products Liability Litigation**  The lawsuit alleges that CAT’s exhaust emission control system, known as the CAT Regeneration  System (“CRS”), failed to work reliably, causing its EPA 2007 Compliant Caterpillar On Highway C13 and C15 engines (manufactured in 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009), including the CRS components incorporated therewith (“Subject Engines”) to derate (lose horsepower) and shut down, requiring CAT-authorized, dealer technicians, to repair the Subject Engines, which they allegedly could not effectively do. The complaint in the lawsuit alleges that the CRS failed to operate under all conditions and all applications on a consistent and reliable basis even after repeated CRS warranty repairs and replacements. Allegedly, these repeated warranty repairs and replacements failed to correct the CRS issues, resulting in damages to the owners and lessees of vehicles with the Subject Engines. The alleged damages included diminished value of the vehicles powered by the Subject Engines, out-of pocket costs such as repair invoices, towing costs, vehicle rental costs and related hotel/taxi charges. Among other claims, the complaint alleges causes of action for breach of express warranty. The Class is described as: all persons or entities in the United States who are original purchasers or original lessees, subsequent purchasers or subsequent lessees, (including but not limited to those having purchased via a TRAC option or some rights to residual purchase of vehicles at lease end) of a vehicle powered by a Subject Engine. | **4-21-2016** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:**  **Theodore J. Leopold**  **COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS &**  **TOLL PLLC**  **2925 PGA Boulevard**  **Suite 200**  **Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410**  **561 515-1400 (Ph.)**  [**tleopold@cohenmilstein.com**](mailto:tleopold@cohenmilstein.com) |
| **4-22-2016** | **15-CV-1685** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Hundai Sonata Engine Litigation**  Plaintiffs allege that the Class Vehicles suffer from a defect that can cause engine seizure, stalling, engine noise, and oil light illumination. The Plaintiffs also allege that engine seizure or stalling can be dangerous. The Plaintiffs also allege that some owners and lessees have been improperly denied repairs under the vehicle’s warranty. The Class is described as all who bought or leased a 2011-2014 model year Hyundai Sonata. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Matthew D. Schelkopf**  **MCCUNEWRIGHT, LLP**  **1055 Westlakes Drive**  **Suite 300**  **Berwyn, PA 19312**  **909 557-1250 (Ph.)**  **909 557-1275 (Fax)**  [**mds@mccunewright.com**](mailto:mds@mccunewright.com) |
| **4-22-2016** | **14-CV-577** | **(W.D.N.C.)** | **U.S. Airline Pilots Association (USAPA) v. Roger Velez, and Leonidas, LLC**  Three members of USAPA commenced an action in federal court for the Western District of North Carolina arising under Title V of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act (“LMRDA”) against current and former USAPA officers and members of the Board of Pilot Representatives(“BPR”), in their individual capacities, alleging, inter alia, that defendants breached their fiduciary duties by expending USAPA funds after it was decertified on matters that were not collective legal action on behalf of the pilot group. It is further alleged that USAPA breached its duty of fair representation on behalf of the pilot group. The Class is described as all pilots who were employed by US Airlines/American Airlines as of 9-16-2014 and who were listed on the US Airways East and/or West Pilot Seniority List. | **8-30-2016** | **For more information write to:**  **Class Counsel for**  **West Pilot Settlement**  **Mary Harper**  **ASU Alumni Law Group**  **2 N. Central Avenue**  **Suite 1600**  **Phoenix, AZ 85004**  **602 251-3620 (Ph.)**  **602 251-8055 (Fax)**  **Class Counsel for**  **East Pilot Settlement**  **Lee Seham**  **Seham, Scham, Meltz &**  **Petersen, LLP**  **199 Main Street, 7th Floor**  **White Plains, NY 10601**  **914 997-1346 (Ph.)**  **914 997-7125 (Fax)** |
| **4-22-2016** | **12-MD-02311** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Mitsubishi Electric US Holding, Inc., and Mitsubishi Electric Automotive America, Inc. (the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants”)**  Automobile Dealer/End-Payor-plaintiffs allege in two separate lawsuits that the Defendants conspired to fix, maintain, and artificially raise the price of certain component vehicle parts.  The lawsuits claim that, as a result of the relevant Defendants’ conduct, Dealers-End-Payers paid more than they should have for the parts at issue and paid more for the vehicles in which those parts are contained.  The first Class Members are described as: All Automobile Dealers who were not able to pass on all of these increased costs to their customers. The second Class Members are described as: All persons and entities who, during the Class Period, purchased or leased a new Vehicle in the United States for personal use and not for resale which were manufactured or sold by any Defendant, any current or former subsidiary of a Defendant or any co-conspirator of a Defendant. See web site for Dealers covered by settlement. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call or visit:**  **888 565-3171 (Ph.)**  [**www.autodealersettlement.com**](http://www.autodealersettlement.com) |
| **4-25-2016** | **14-CV-00227** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **In re: NII Holdings, Inc., Securities Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Steven P. Dussek, Gkul V. Hemmady, and Steven M. Shindler (“Defendants”)**  Plaintiff alleges violations of Federal Securities Laws under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated under the Act. The Complaint alleges that NII and Defendants made materially false or misleading statements concerning: (i) customer Quality; (ii) the impact of the shutdown of Sprint’s U.S. iDEN network on NII; and (iii) NII’s progress in the development and testing of NII’s 3GPTT (“push-to-talk”) services, and the resulting impact on the Company’s financial condition and operational health. The Complaint alleges that these statements caused the prices of NII Stock and NII Bonds to be artificially inflated during the Class Period and that the prices of NII Stock and NII Bonds declined when the truth was disclosed. The Class Period is from 2-25-2010 to 2-27-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Labaton Sucharow LLP**  **Joel H. Bernstein**  **140 Broadway**  **New York, NY 10005**  **Kessler Topaz Meltzer &**  **Check, LLP**  **Gregory M. Castaldo**  **280 King of Prussia Road**  **Radnor, PA 19087** |
| **4-27-2016** | **09-MD-2082** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Meridian Funds Group Securities & ERISA Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Meridian Capital Partners, Inc., Meridian Diversified Fund Management, LLC, William H. Lawrence, Donald J. Halldin, John L. Sica, Robert J. Murphy, Howard B. Fisher, Laura K. Smith, Peter M. Brown and Mark A. Hurrell (collectively, the “Defendants”)**  The Action arises from the Bernard L. Madoff scandal. Lead Plaintiff purchased shares in Meridian Diversified Fund Management, LLC (“MDEF”), which allocated a portion of its investable assets to shares of the Rye Select Broad Market XL Portfolio Ltd. (the “Rye Fund”), an investment fund managed by Tremont Partners, Inc. The Rye Fund entered into “total return” swap transactions with various financial institutions, under which these swap counterparties would provide the Rye Fund with a return linked to the economic performance of an investment fund sub-advised by Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC, in exchange for payment by the Rye Fund of a floating rate of interest on any leverage embedded in the swap. Lead Plaintiff alleges that Defendants acted imprudently by allowing a portion of MDEF’s assets to be invested in the Rye Fund. The Class Period is from 3-24-2004 to 12-11-2008. | **9-7-2016** | **For more information write to:**  **ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP**  **ELLEN GUSIKOFF**  **STEWART**  **655 West Broadway, Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **4-28-2016** | **14-CV-21384** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Renata Cireco-Loudon, et al. v. Green Tree Servicing, LLC, et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that when a borrower was required to have insurance for his or her property pursuant to a residential mortgage or home equity loan or line of credit, and evidence of acceptable coverage was not provided (for example, when the insurance policy did not exist or had lapsed), Green Tree would place insurance in a manner such that Green Tree received an unauthorized benefit. Plaintiffs allege further that Green Tree did so primarily to receive “kickbacks” in the form of commissions from other Defendants. Plaintiffs also allege that the way in which Lender Placed Insurance policies were obtained and placed caused the rates and the amount of coverage to be excessive. The Class Period is from 1-1-2008 to 12-8-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Adam M. Moskowitz**  **Kozyak Tropin &**  **Throckm Orton LLP**  **2525 Ponce de Leon Blvd. 9th Floor**  **Coral Gables, FL 33134** |
| **4-28-2016** | **08-WP-65000**  **06-CV-07023**  **07-CV-00412**  **08-CV-01832** | **(N.D. OH.)**  **(N.D. Ill.)** | **In re: Whirlpool Corporation Front-Loading Washer Products Liability Litigation**  **In re: Sears, Roebuck and Company Front-Loading Washer Products Liability Litigation (consolidated)**  Plaintiff alleges that certain front-loading washing machines manufactured between 2001 and 2010 fail to adequately self-clean themselves of laundry residue, resulting in mold or mildew buildup that can cause bad odors and ruined laundry. Visit [www.WasherSettlement.com](http://www.WasherSettlement.com) for a complete list of the washer models that are included in the settlement, referred to as the “Class Washers.” The Class is described as: all residents of the United States and its territories who (a) purchased a new Class Washer; (b) acquired a new Class Washer as part of a purchase or remodel of a home; or (c) received as a gift a new Class Washer. | **9-7-2016** | **For more information visit:**  [**www.WasherSettlement.com**](http://www.WasherSettlement.com) |
| **4-28-2016** | **15-CV-5273** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Elisa W., et al. v. The City of New York**  **Re Defendants: New York City Administration for Children’s Services; Gladys Carrion, Commissioner of the New York City Administration for Children’s Services, in her official capacity; the State of New York; the New York State Office of Children and Family Services; and Sheila J. Poole, Acting Commissioner of the New York State Office of Children and Family Services, in her official capacity (the “Defendants”)**  The lawsuit claims that the Defendants have failed to protect children in foster care from harm and, in failing to do so, have violated the children’s rights. The lawsuit also alleges that the Defendants have violated federal and state law that requires them to create plans to make sure children have safe and permanent homes and are provided with needed services. By filing this lawsuit, the Plaintiffs sought a court order that would require the State and City defendants to act in certain ways to protect children in foster care. The Class is described as: All children who are now or who will be in the foster care custody of the Commissioner of the City of New York, the New York State Administration for Children’s Services during the time period that this settlement is in effect. | **8-5-2016** | **For more information call:**  **Cravath, Swaine &**  **Moore LLP**  **212 474-2100 (Ph.)** |
| **4-29-2016** | **13-CV-03826**  **15-CV-00262** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **O’Connor v. Uber Technologies, Inc.**  **Yucesoy v. Uber Technologies, Inc.**  Plaintiffs are drivers who allege that Uber has misclassified them as independent contractors, as opposed to employees. In the O’Connor lawsuit, the plaintiffs alleged that because drivers are employees, certain of Uber’s conduct and policies toward drivers in California violated California labor law. Specifically, the plaintiffs claimed Uber failed to reimburse drivers for vehicle-related and phone expenses and failed to pass along to drivers the entire portion of the fare that allegedly represents a tip. Plaintiffs also alleged that because drivers are employees,certain of Uber’s conduct and policies toward drivers in Massachusetts violated Massachusetts labor law. Specifically, the plaintiffs claimed Uber unlawfully classified drivers as independent contractors, failed to reimburse drivers for their expenses, failed to pass along to drivers the entire portion of the fare that allegedly represents a tip, and interfered with drivers’ relationships with passengers. The Class Period is from 8-16-2009 to date of Preliminary Approval Order. | **9-29-2016** | **For more information write, call or e-mail**  **Shannon Liss-Riordan**  **Adelaide Pagano**  **LICHTEN & LISS-RIORDAN,**  **P.C.**  **729 Boylston Street, Suite 2000**  **Boston, MA 02116**  **617 994-5800 (Ph.)**  [**uberlawsuit@llrlaw.com**](mailto:uberlawsuit@llrlaw.com) |
| **4-29-2016** | **14-CV-478**  **14-CV-713**  **14-CV-1099**  **14-CV-1105**  **14-CV-1192**  **14-CV-1193**  **14-CV-1316**  **14-CV-2023** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Sciortino v. PepsiCo. Inc. (all cases consolidated)**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Defendant failed to disclose material facts regarding the presence and amount of 4-MeI in certain PepsiCo beverages. Defendant’s omissions of material fact were intentional and made with knowledge as to the presence of 4-MeI in levels that exceed the No Significant Risk Level (“NSRL”) in California. Defendant’s omissions were material because a reasonable consumer would not have purchased or paid as much for the Pepsi Beverages if it were known that they contained excess levels of 4-MeI. The Class Period is from 1-1-2010 to date of Preliminary Approval Order. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **DANIEL L. WARSHAW**  **BOBBY POUYA**  **ALEXANDER R. SAFYAN**  **PEARSON, SIMON &**  **WARSHAW, LLP**  **15165 Ventura Boulevard Suite 400**  **Sherman Oaks, CA 91403**  **818 788-8300 (Ph.)**  **818) 788-8104 (Fax)**  [**dwarshaw@pswlaw.com**](mailto:dwarshaw@pswlaw.com)  [**bpouya@pswlaw.com**](mailto:bpouya@pswlaw.com)  [**asafyan@pswlaw.com**](mailto:asafyan@pswlaw.com) |
| **4-29-2016** | **12-CV-06051** | **(W.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Eastman Kodak ERISA Litigation**  Plaintiffs are plan participants who allege that Defendants were fiduciaries of the Plans and violated the fiduciary duties of loyalty, care and prudence under ERISA that they owed to participants in the Plans regarding investment of the assets of the Plans in Kodak stock. In the Complaint, Plaintiffs asserted causes of action for the losses they allege were suffered by the Plans as the result of the alleged breaches of fiduciary duties by the Defendants. The Class Period is from 1-1-2010- to 3-31-2012 | **8-22-2016** | **For more information write to:**  **Gerald Wells III**  **Connolly, Wells & Gray,**  **LLP**  **2200 Renaissance Blvd.**  **King of Prussia, PA 19406** |