|  **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name**  **Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **Website Link** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **12-1-2015** | **14-CV-1413** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Edward Fonts, et al. v. Heritage Operating, L.P., et al.**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Heritage engaged in unfair and deceptive trade practices toward its laid-in-cost-based (“LIC-based”) Customers by falsely overstating the laid-in-cost of propane, thereby overcharging Heritage’s LIC-based Customers. Plaintiffs seek to assert his claims on behalf of a class of all former Heritage LIC-based Customers in California that purchased propane from Heritage from 1-1-2008 to 8-31-2012, the Class Period.  | **3-28-2016** | Prepared by Brenda Berkley**For more information write to:****William Pettersen****Pettersen & Bark****205 West Date Street****San Diego, CA 92101****R. Craig Clark****James M. Treglio****Clark & Treglio****205 West Date Street****San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **12-2-2015** | **14-CV-01278** | **(W.D. Pa.)** | **Jahoda, et al. v. Redbox Automated Retail, LLC**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Redbox Automated Retail, LLC (“Redbox”) violated federal law under the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq., by offering video and video game rental services at self-service, touchscreen kiosks that are not fully accessible to, and usable by, blind people. The Class is described as all legally blind individuals who have attempted, will attempt, or have been deterred from attempting to use Redbox kiosks in all 50 states and the District of Columbia except California (the “Class”).  | **4-27-2016** | **For more information visit:**[**www.redboxadasettlement.com**](http://www.redboxadasettlement.com) |
| **12-2-2015** | **08-CV-10261** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **William Ross v. Reserve Management Company Inc., et al.****Re Defendant:****TD Ameritrade Holding Corporation**Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that each of the Reserve Defendants’ July 2007 prospectus documents emphasized the Fund’s focus on “preservation of capital and liquidity” and a stable “$1.00 share price.” Lead Plaintiff alleges that the Prospectus contains misstatements and omissions of material facts, including but not limited to:(i) The Fund was no longer adhering to the stated objectives of preserving capital, providing liquidity, and protecting share price stability, but in an effort to achieve greater yields was pursuing riskier instruments; and (ii) The Reserve entities did not have adequate resources or financial support to preserve capital and maintain a stable $1.00 per share net asset value. The Class Period is from 1-18-2007 to 9-16-2008. | **3-4-2016** | **For more information write to:****HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL**  **SHAPIRO LLP****Reed Kathrein****715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 202****Berkeley, CA 94710** |
| **12-3-2015** | **08-CV-10261** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **William Ross, et al. v. Reserve Management Co., Inc., et al.****Re Defendants:****Reserve Management Company, Inc., Reserve Partners, Inc., Reserve Management Corporation, Bruce Bent Sr., Bruce R. Bent II, and Arthur T. Bent III** See CAFA Notice above for more information. | **3-4-2016** | **For more information write to:****HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL** **SHAPIRO LLP****Reed Kathrein, Esq.****715 Hearst Avenue****Suite 202****Berkeley, CA 94710** |
| **12-3-2015** | **14-CV-11191** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **Pio v. General Motors Company, et al.**Securities-purchaser-plaintiff asserts claims against General Motors Company (“GM”) and certain current and former directors or employees of GM, Daniel F. Akerson, Nicholas S. Cyprus, Christopher P. Liddell, Daniel Ammann, Charles K. Stevens, III, Mary T. Barra, Thomas S. Timko, and Gay Kent (collectively with GM, “the Defendants) under Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the“Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, and against the Individual Defendants under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. The Complaint alleges that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements and omitted material facts about GM’s liabilities, internal controls and commitment to safety. Specifically, the Complaint alleges that, during the Settlement Class Period, Defendants: misrepresented, by materially understating, GM’s product warranty and recall liabilities; misrepresented that GM’s product warranty and recall liabilities complied with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP); misrepresented that GM’s internal controls over financial reporting were effective; and misrepresented that GM was a company that was committed to customer safety. The Complaint further alleges in detail that GM and theIndividual Defendants knew of or recklessly disregarded safety defects in the ignition switches contained in millions of GM’s cars, failed to properly account for the associated financial liabilities and maintained grossly ineffective internal controls that were exploited in misrepresenting the Company’s true liabilities. The Complaint further alleges that the price of GM common stock was artificially inflated as a result of Defendants’ false and misleading statements and omissions, and declined when the truth was revealed through a series of corrective disclosures in 2014. The Class Period is from 11-17-2010 to 7-24-2014. | **4-20-2016** | **For more information write to:****Bernstein Litowitz Berger** **& Grossmann LLP****Salvatore J. Graziano****1251 Avenue of the** **Americas****44th Floor****New York, NY 10020** |
| **12-7-2015** | **12-CV-5329** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Carpenters Trust Fund of St. Louis v. Barclays PLC.**Purchaser-plaintiffalleges that, during the Class Period, Defendants made false and misleading statements regarding, among other things, U.S. Dollar LIBOR submissions that attempted to influence the market’s perception of Barclays’ financial health and liquidity. The complaint was brought on behalf of a proposed class consisting of all persons and entities that purchased Barclays American Depositary Shares. The Class Period is from 7-10-2007 to 6-27-2012. | **3-14-2016** | **For more information write to:****David A. Rosenfeld****ROBBINS GELLER****RUDMAN & DOWD****LLP****58 South Service Road****Suite 200****Melville, NY 11747** |
| **12-9-2015** | **11-CV-3480** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **James Estakhrian, et al. v. Obenstine, et al.**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that the Defendants breached their fiduciary duties and committed malpractice, and otherwise engaged in unlawful conduct, in representing a class of individuals who put earnest money deposits toward the purchase of units in the Cosmopolitan but only received a partial refund of their deposits through the Wattlitigation. Plaintiffs contend that the K&S Defendants acted as attorneys for the class in the *Watt* action. The Court defined the Class for purposes of this settlement only to include all class members (i*.*e., those individuals who did not opt out) in Daniel Watt, et al. v. Nevada Property 1, LLC, et al., Nevada District Court, Case No. A582541. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Irvine Law Group, LLP****S. Ron Alikani****7700 Irvine Center Drive Suite 800****Irvine, California 92618****949 653-6153 (Ph.)****949 653-1277 (Fax.)****ralikani@irvinelawgroup.com** |
| **12-10-2015** | **15-CV-00152** | **(W.D.N.Y.)** | **Christopher Globus and Michaelene Dawson v. Pioneer Credit Recovery, Inc.**A proposed class action settlement has been filed in the United States District Court for the Western District of New York, the Honorable John T. Curtain presiding, encompassing all claims in the Action. For more information see CAFA Notice dated 11-10-2015. | **7-27-2016** | **For more information write to:****James L. Davidson****Greenwald Davidson Radbil** **PLLC** **5550 Glades Road****Suite 500****Boca Paton, FL 33431** |
| **12-10-2015** | **13-CV-07632** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Shahar Lushe and William Youngblood v. Verengo, Inc. d/b/a Verengo Solar**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Verengo and/or its vendor violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq. (“TCPA”) by making automated or auto dialed calls to cellular telephones, making calls using an artificial or pre recorded voice to residential telephones, and calling telephone numbers registered on the National Do Not Call Registry without prior express consent from the called party. The Class is described as: all who received on or after 10-16-2009 an automated/auto-dialed call made to any cellular/residential telephone number registered on the National Do-Not-Call registry.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information e-mail Defendants Attorney:****ATagvoryan@BlankRome.com** |
| **12-11-2015** | **11-CV-2598** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Puda Coal Securities, Inc. et al. Litigation****Re Defendants:****Lawrence S. Wizel and C. Mark Tang, the former independent U.S.-based directors of Puda Coal, Inc. (“Puda”) (collectively, the “U.S. Directors”)**On 12-1-2015, the U.S. Directors and Plaintiffs in the Action submitted to the Court a proposed settlement of all claims asserted against the U.S. Directors in the Action, which is conditioned on, among other things, Court approval. For more information see CAFA Notice dated 10-23-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Lionel Z. Glancy****GLANCY PRONGAY & MURRAY**  **LLP****1925 Century Park East, Ste. 2100****Los Angeles, CA 90067** |
| **12-11-2015** | **13-CV-07608**  | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: NQ Mobile, Inc. Securities Litigation**Purchaser-plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the federal securities laws by disseminating materially false or misleading information about the Company, its products and performance. Pursuant to the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, the Court consolidated the various related class actions that had been brought and renamed the consolidated action “In re NQ Mobile, Inc. Securities Litigation,Case No. 1:13-cv-07608-WHP”. On July 21, 2014, Lead Plaintiffs filed their Consolidated Class Action Complaint (“Amended Complaint”) against defendants NQ, Henry Yu Lin, Omar Sharif Khan, Wenyong “Vincent” Shi, Suhai Ji, and K.B. Teo (collectively referred to herein as the “Settling Defendants” or “NQ Defendants”). Also named as defendants were PricewaterhouseCoopersZhong Tian LLP (“PwC-ZT”) and PricewaterhouseCoopers International Limited (“PwC-IL,” which, together with PwC-ZT, are collectively referred to herein as the “Auditor Defendants”). The Amended Complaint asserted claims pursuant to §§10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder (17 C.F.R. 240.10b-5), on behalf of a class of all persons or entities that purchased or otherwise acquired NQ ADS shares during the Class Period. The Class Period is from 3-6-2013 to 7-3-2014. | **3-11-2016** | **For more information write:****William C. Fredericks****Scott+Scott**  **Attorney At Law, LLP****The Chrysler Building****405 Lexington Avenue****40th Floor****New York, NY 10174** |
| **12-15-2015** | **14-CV-2522** | **(D. Minn)** | **In re: Target Corporation Customer Data Security Breach Litigation**Consumer-plaintiff asserts that on 12-19-2013, Target announced that third-party intruders had breached it computer systems and stolen credit and debit card information from certain Target shoppers who shopped at Target from 11-27 through 12-18-2013. Plaintiffs claim that Target negligently failed to provide sufficient data security, allowing unauthorized parties to access payment card data. Plaintiffs also claim that Target violated Minnesota’s Plastic Card Security Act, and that Target’s violation of that Act constitutes negligence per se. The Class is described as: financial institutions organized under the laws of the U.S. or a Territories thereof; issued one or more payment cards that were identified as having been at risk as a result of the Target Data Breach by: (i) Visa, in an alert in the US-2013-1335-IC series; (ii) MasterCard, in an alert in the ADC1904-US-13 series, the ADC1924-US-13 series, or the ADC1948-US-13 series; (iii) Discover, in an alert similar to the foregoing VISA and MasterCard alerts, including an alert in the DCA-US-2013-1085 series; or (iv) American Express or JCB in an alert similar to the foregoing Visa and MasterCard alerts; and have not previously released claims against Target with respect to all compromised accounts, for example, by signing a release while participating in a settlement offered by Visa. | **5-10-2016** | **For more information call or visit:****1 877-805-8780 (Ph.)**[**www.TargetBankSettlement.com**](http://www.TargetBankSettlement.com) |
| **12-16-2015** | **13-CV-03094** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Elena Fridman, et al. v. NYCB Mortgage Company, LLC**Borrower-plaintiffs allege that NYCB failed to credit class members’ mortgage payments on the date that an online authorization for the payment was submitted. Plaintiffs claim that NYCB’s failure to credit online authorizations on the same day and imposing a late fee violates federal law, the Truth in Lending Act.The Class Period is from 4-24-2012 to 5-14-2013. | **4-20-2016** | **For more information write, fax or e-mail:****Daniel A. Edelman****Edelman, Combs, Latturner** **& Goodwin, LLC****20 South Clark Street****Suite 1500****Chicago, IL 60603****312 419-0379 (Fax)****info@edcombs.com****charpie@edcombs.com** |
| **12-16-2015** | **12-CV-01737** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Bridgepoint Education, Inc. Securities Litigation**Purchaser-plaintiff alleges that during the Class Period, Defendants made materially false and misleading statements during Bridgepoint’s Ashford University’s (“Ashford”) pursuit of accreditation with the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (“WASC”) regarding Ashford’s prospects for achieving WASC accreditation and certain facets of Ashford’s educational model and success of operations. Lead Plaintiffs also allege that Defendants made false and misleading financial projections and that the Individual Defendants transacted in Bridgepoint stock in violation of §20A of the Exchange Act. Lead Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants’ materially false and misleading statements artificially inflated the price of Bridgepoint common stock, and when the truth was eventually disclosed, the Class suffered substantial damages. The Class Period is from 5-3-2011 to 7-13-2012. | **4-25-2016** | **For more information write to:****Jonah H. Goldstein****Laurie L. Largent****ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP****655 West Broadway, Suite 1900****San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **12-17-2015** | **13-CV-11390** | **(D. Mass.)** | **LaPan, et al. v. Dick’s Sporting Goods, Inc.**Employee-plaintiffs allege on behalf of themselves and other current and former Assistant Store Managers in the job positions of Hardlines Managers, Sales Support Managers, and Softlines Managers (collectively “Assistant Store Managers” or “ASMs”), employed byDefendant in the United States, who elect to opt into this action pursuant to the Fair LaborStandards Act (hereinafter the “FLSA”), 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), that they are entitled to, inter alia: (i) unpaid overtime wages for hours worked above 40 in a workweek, as required by law; and (ii) liquidated damages pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 et seq.The Class is described as all persons employed by Dick’s Sporting Goods, Inc. as Assistant Store Managers in the position of Hardlines Manager, Sales Support Manager or Softlines Manager in the State of Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio Oregon, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia or Wisconsin during the relevant time period. The Class Period is from 6-10-2013 to 11-5-2015. | **4-1-2016**  | **For more information write or call:****Klafter, Olsen & Lesser,** **LLP****Two International Drive****Rye Brook, NY 10573****914 934-9200 (Ph.)****Hepworth Gershbaum & Roth PLLC****192 Lexington Avenue****New York, NY 10026****212 545-1199** |
| **12-18-2016** | **14-CV-12655** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Andréa Spence, et al. v. Cavalry Portfolio Services, LLC, et al.**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Cavalry violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. §1692, and M.G.L. c. 93 §§ 49 and 54, by charging interest that Plaintiff contends is not owed. The Class Period is from 3-14-2010 to present. | **Not set yet** | **For more informaion write to:****Elizabeth Ryan****Bailey & Glasser LLP****99 High Street****Suite 304****Boston, MA 02110** |
| **12-18-2015** | **14-CV-02363** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Herremans v. BMW of North America, LLC**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that the original water pump in certain MINI vehicles with thermo-plastic housing (MINI Part No. 11 51 7 550 484) is defective because it is prone to leaking and failure. The lawsuit asserts claims against the authorized U.S. distributor of MINI vehicles, BMW of North America, LLC (“MINI”) for: (1) violation of California Civil Code § 1750 et seq. (“CLRA”); (2) violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq. (“UCL”); and (3) fraud. The Class is described as: all residents of the United States (including Puerto Rico) who currently own or lease, or who previously owned or leased, a “Class Vehicle.”A Class Vehicle is any MINI R55, R56, R57, R58, R59, and R60 vehicle, made for sale and/or lease in the U.S. market, with a production date between October 2006 through November 2012, and that was sold or leased to the Class Member who registered and operated the vehicle in the United States and Puerto Rico. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Stephen M Harris, Law Office of Stephen M.**  **Harris, P.C.****6320 Canoga Avenue****Suite 1500** **Woodland Hills, CA 91367****818 924-3103 (Ph.)****Stephen@smh-legal.com** |
| **12-18-2016** | **14-CV-01956** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **In re: CytRx Corporation Securities Litigation**Investor-plaintiff allegesthat the price of CytRx securities was artificially inflated during the Class Period as a result of alleged false and misleading statements and omissions by Defendants during the Class Period concerning, *inter alia*, the Company’s undisclosed relationship with stock promotion firm, the DreamTeam Group. The Class Period is from 11-20-2013 to 3-13-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, visit, call or fax:****Kahn Swick & Foti, LLC****Lewis S. Kahn****206 Covington Street****Madisonville, LA 70447****Lewis.kahn@ksfcounsel.com****504 455-1400 (Ph.)****504 455-1498 (Fax)** |
| **12-18-2015** | **10-CV-2190** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Marchese v. Cablevision** Subscriber-plaintiff claims Cablevision unreasonably restrained competition in the market for Cable TV Set-Top boxes that provided “Two Way Services,” and forced Cablevision subscribers to pay inflated rates for the rental and use of Cable TV Set-Top boxes distributed by Cablevision. The Class Period is from 4-30-2004 to date of preliminary approval order. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Brett Cebulash, Esq.****Kevin Landau, Esq.****Taus, Cebulash &** **Landau, LLP****80 Maiden Lane****Suite 1204****New York, NY 10038** |
| **12-18-2016** | **11-CV-1663** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Gaudin v. Saxon Mortgage Services, Inc.**Participant-plaintiff alleges that Saxon improperly collected Home Affordable Mortgage Program (“HAMP”) Trial Period Plan (“TPP”) trial period payments from the Class Members and/or improperly denied permanent HAMP loan modifications to Class Members in violation of California law. The Class Members are all California residential mortgage borrowers who: (a) entered into HAMP TPPs with Saxon effective on or before October 1, 2009; and (b) made at least three trial period payments, but (c) did not receive permanent HAMP loan modifications.  | **11-16-2015** | **For more information visit:**[**www.saxonmortgagehampclassaction.com**](http://www.saxonmortgagehampclassaction.com) |
| **12-21-2015** | **14-CV-01549** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Michele Lee Tannlund v. Real Time Resolutions, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Real Time Resolutions, Inc. violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) 47 U.S.C. § 227 by using an automatic telephone dialing system or a prerecorded or artificial voice to call cellular telephones without permission in connection with the servicing of a debt that was owed. The Class Period is from 8-30-2009 to date of Preliminary Approval Order. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Mark Ankcorn****Ankcorn Law Firm, PC****11622 El Camino Real Suite 100****Del Mar, CA 92130****619 870-0600 (Ph.)****mark@ankcorn.com** |
| **12-22-2016** | **13-CV-597** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Reeves, et al. v. Zealandia Holding Company, Inc., et al.**Purchaser-plaintiffs’ claims arise out of their purchase of Vacation Owner Interest (“VOI”) at the Resort from Celebration and their enrollment in the RCI, LLC (“RCI”) Points Exchange Program. After an affiliate of Zealandia Holding Company, Inc. (“ZHC”) acquired the “developer’s rights” for the Resort and Patton Hospitality Management, Inc. (“PHM”) undertook management of the Resort, the RCI Points associated with Plaintiffs’ VOI that were allocated to their RCI Points accounts were reduced. Although Plaintiffs and many members of the class acquired their VOI through an “upgrade” transaction (where they traded in a previously acquired VOI in exchange for a new VOI), the class claims focus solely on the transaction where Settlement Class Members acquired a VOI from Celebration, and the subsequent reduction of the RCI Points associated with the VOI that were allocated to their RCI Points account, regardless of whether there was an “upgraded” transaction. The Class Members are described as: 1) the owner of a VOI at the Resort (or a former owner at the Resort and current member of the Festiva Adventure Club); 2) enrolled in the RCI Points Exchange Program; and 3) in 2013, had RCI Points allocation associated with VOI at the Resort reduced by at least 225,000 RCI Points. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:****www.finnlawgroup.com** |
| **12-22-2015** | **13-CV-6922** | **(S.D.N.Y)** | **In re: BioScrip, Inc. Securities Litigation****Re Defendants:****BioScrip, Inc., Richard M. Smith, Hai V. Tran, Patricia Bogusz, Myron Z. Holubiak, Charlotte W. Collins, Sanuel P. Frieder, David R. Hubers, Richard L. Robbins, Stuart A. Samuels, Gordon H. Woodward, and Kimberlee Seah (collectively, the “BioScrip Defendants”), and Jefferies LLC, Morgan Stanley & Co. LLC, SunTrust Robinson Humphrey, Inc., Dougherty & Company, and Noble International Investments, Inc. (collectively, the “Underwriter Defendants”)**Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the securities laws by engaging in two separate schemes relating to BioScrip’s business. First, the Action alleges that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements and failed to disclose material facts relating to BioScrip’s alleged participation in a kickback scheme concerning a drug called Exjade. Second, the Action alleges that Defendants concealed certain facts regarding the business condition and results of BioScrip’s pharmacy benefit management (“PBM”) business segment. The Action alleges that investors were harmed when the truth about these matters was eventually revealed and that the price of BioScrip’s common stock declined precipitously as a result. The Class Period is from 11-9-2012 to 11-6-2013. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Bernstein Litowitz Berger** **& Grossmann LLP****Hannah G. Ross, Esq.****1251 Avenue of the**  **Americas****44th Floor****New York, NY 10020** |
| **12-22-2015** | **11-CV-01033** | **(M.D. Tenn.)** | **Schuh v. HCA Holdings, Inc., et al.**Purchaser-plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated Sections 11, 12 and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 by failing to disclose material facts regarding HCA’s business, including HCA’s highly profitable cardiovascular business, in the Registration Statement and Prospectus accompanying HCA’s 3-9-2011 initial public offering. After the Complaint was filed, Lead Plaintiff further alleged that HCA’s high margin cardiovascular surgery business was trending down in large part as a result of the discontinuation of unnecessary cardiovascular procedures that HCA had ceased performing as the result of two investigations. The Class Period is from 3-9-2011 to 10-28-2011. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call, write or e-mail:****Rick Nelson****Shareholder Relations****Robbins Geller Rudman &**  **Dowd LLP****655 West Broadway****Suite 1900****San Diego, CA 92101****1 800 449-4900 (Ph.)**[**www.rgrdlaw.com**](http://www.rgrdlaw.com) |
| **12-22-2015** | **12-CV-03852** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: JP Morgan Chase & Co. Securities Litigation**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that on 4-13-2012 Defendants made false and misleading statements about JPMorgan’s risk management practices and about the purposes and activities of its Chief Investment Office (“CIO”). Lead Plaintiffs allege that Defendants represented that CIO played a central role in managing the company’s risks, when, in fact, CIO engaged in speculative, high-risk derivatives trading within one trading portfolio, the synthetic credit portfolio (“SCP”). Lead Plaintiffs allege that the SCP was so large that the London-based trader who helped manage the portfolio was nicknamed the “London Whale” by other credit derivative traders. In May 2012,JPMorgan announced that trades within the SCP lost billions of dollars and the price ofJPMorgan’s stock declined. The Class Period is from 4-13-2012 to 5-21-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Bernstein Litowitz Berger**  **& Grossmann LLP****Salvatore J. Graziano****1251 Avenue of the** **Americas****44th Floor****New York, NY 10020** |
| **12-23-2015** | **15-CV-03289** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Larry Tran v. Catalina Channel Express, Inc.(“Tran”)**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Catalina Channel Express, Inc. (“Catalina Express”) willfully and/or negligently failed to comply with the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act of 2003, 15 U.S.C. § 1681c(g) (“FACTA”). FACTA requires that credit and debit card receipts (that are printed by Catalina Express at its ticket counter locations and are provided to customers) should not display the expiration date of the credit/debit card. Plaintiff Tran alleges that Catalina Express printed the credit/debit card expiration date on customer receipts. The Class Period is from 3-6-2013 to 3-9-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Chant Yedalian, Esq., Chant & Company****A Professional Law**  **Corporation****1010 N. Central Avenue Glendale, CA 91202****chant@chant.mobi****877 574-7100 (Ph.)** |
| **12-23-2015** | **13-CV-01151** | **(W.D. Mo.)** | **Brown v. Ally Financial, Inc.**Purchaser-plaintiff alleges that Ally Financial, Inc. (“Ally”) and CNA National Warranty Corporation (“CNA”) (collectively “Defendants”) failed to properly sell, issue, finance, and administer “gap” contracts in connection with new automobile financing. The lawsuit alleges that the Companies breached class members’ gap contracts by improperly interpreting and administering the contracts, which resulted in less funds being waived from account balances owed on class members’ vehicles that were deemed a total loss after an accident or theft. The Class Period is from 1-1-2003 to 11-30-2015.  | **3-25-2016** | **For more information write or call:****Robert A. Horn****Joseph A. Kronawitter****Horn Aylward & Bandy, LLC****2600 Grand Boulevard****Suite 1100****Kansas City, MO 64108****816 421-0700 (Ph.)** |
| **12-23-2015** | **13-CV-5959** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Adrian Alani, et al. v. FC Harris Pavilion Apartments Limited Partnership, et al.**Tenant-plaintiffs have asserted claims against defendants under: (1) the Chicago Residential Landlord-Tenant Ordinance (“RLTO”) Sections 5-12-070, 5-12-080, 5-12-110, and 5-12-140 and (2) other state statutory and common law, in connection with defendants’ practices concerning security deposit handling and disclosure, early lease termination disclosure, and maintenance and repair of the premises at the Pavilion Apartments in Chicago,Illinois. The Class Period is from 1-1-2012 to 12-18-2015. | **4-5-2016** | **For more information visit or call:**[**www.PavilionSettlement.com**](http://www.PavilionSettlement.com)**1 800 216-4990 (Ph.)** |
| **12-28-2015** | **15-CV-00450** | **(E.D. Mo.)** | **Suzanne Degnen, D.M.D., P.C. v. Scheduling Institute, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Scheduling Institute violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq. (the “TCPA”), by sending fax advertisements that did not contain the required opt-out notice and without prior express consent of Plaintiff and the putative class members. The Class Period is from 2-5-2011 to date of Preliminary Approval Order. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Ronald J. Eisenberg** **Schultz & Associates LLP** **640 Cepi Drive****Suite A** **Chesterfield, MO 63005**  |
| **12-29-2015** | **12-CV-01997** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Paul Stemple, et al. v. QC Holding, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that QC, the defendant in this lawsuit, violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) by calling non-customers on their cell phones for debt collection purposes with either an automated telephone dialing system or by an artificial or prerecorded voice message, without the person’s prior express consent. The Class Period is from 8-13-2008 to 8-13-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**HYDE & SWIGARTJoshua B. Swigart, Esq.2221 Camino Del Rio SouthSuite 101San Diego, CA 92108 |
| **12-29-2015** | **15-CV-1572** | **(D. Md.)** | **Christopher Garza, et al. v. Mitchell Rubenstein and Associates, P.C.**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Defendant violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act by sending improper debt collection letters to consumers in an attempt to collect debts on behalf of Bank of America, N.A. The Class Period is from 5-31-2014 to 5-31-2015. | **4-25-2016** | **For more information write to:****Jesse S. Johnson****Greenwald Davidson** **Radbil PLLC****5550 Glades Road****Suite 500****Boca Raton, FL 33431** |
| **12-29-2015** | **13-CV-05199** | **(W.D. Ark.)** | **Dianne Estes, et al. v. P.A.M. Transport, Inc., et al.**Driver-plaintiffs allege that P.A.M. violated the federal Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”) and the Arkansas Minimum Wage Law by failing to pay over-the-road drivers an amount equal to at least the federal minimum and state minimum hourly wage for compensable work. The Lawsuit contends that P.A.M. violated the law by failing to pay for certain activities which thePlaintiffs allege are compensable as a matter of law, including driving time, on-duty not driving time, and time spent in a truck’s sleeper berth beyond 8 hours per day. The Class Period is from 8-22-2010 to 12-5-2013. | **1-20-2016** | **For more information write, visit, call, fax or e-mail:****Justin L. Swidler, Esq.****Richard S. Swartz, Esq.****Swartz Swidler, LLC****1101 Kings Hwy N.****Suite 402****Cherry Hill, NJ 08034**[**http://www.swartz-legal.com**](http://www.swartz-legal.com)**856 685-7420 (Ph.)****Toll Free:****1 877-529-9501 (Ph.)****856 685-7417 (Fax)****jswidler@swartz-legal.com** |
| **12-30-2015** | **14-CV-01940** | **(D.D.C.)** | **Benny Blocker v. Marshalls of MA, Inc., et al.**Employee-plaintiff alleges that Marshalls violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.(“FCRA”). The lawsuit raised class claims alleging that Marshalls obtained consumer reports on employees and terminated certain employees based in whole or in part on information contained in those consumer reports without following the FCRA’s required procedures. The Class Period is from 11-18-2012 to 9-1-2015. | **5-10-2016** | **For more information write to:****Leonard A. Bennett****Consumer Litigation** **Association, P.C.****763 J Clyde Morris Blvd.****Suite 1A****Newport News, VA 23601** |
| **12-30-2016** | **08-CV-00042** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Precision Associates, Inc. v. Panalpina World Transport (Holding) LTD – Notice for the Second Round of Settlements****Re Defendants:****Deutsche Post AG; Danzas Corporation d/b/a DHL Global Forwarding; DHL Express (USA) Inc.; DHL Global Forwarding Japan K.K.; DHL Japan Inc.; Exel Global Logistics, Inc.; Air Express International USA, Inc. (collectively, “DHL”)**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that the companies conspired, in violation of antitrust laws, to fix the prices for freight forwarding services during certain time periods. Plaintiffs claim that Defendants’ conspiracies were worldwide, including on shipping routes between the United States and China, Hong Kong, Japan, Taiwan, the United Kingdom and other parts of Europe. Plaintiffs claim that Defendants agreed to fix various charges and surcharges associated with providing freight forwarding services. The Class Period is from 1-1-2001 to 1-4-2011. | **11-2-2015** | **For more information call or visit:****1 877-276-7340 (Ph.)**[**www.freightforwardcase.com**](http://www.freightforwardcase.com) |
| **12-30-2015** | **13-CV-05665** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **John Lofton, et al. v. Verizon Wireless (VAW) LLC, et al.**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Collecto recorded debt collection calls it placed on behalf of Verizon which reached wrong cellular telephone numbers without warning to the recipient or the recipient’s authorization, in violation of California’s Invasion of Privacy Act (“IPA”). The lawsuit also claims that Collecto placed calls to cellular telephones with an automatic dialer without the recipient’s authorization, in violation of the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”). The two Class Periods are: TCPA Class Period is from 6-14-2008 to date on which Notice is completed; and for the IPA is from 9-10-2010 to date on which Notice is completed. | **5-24-2016** | **For more information write to:****Ethan Preston****Preston Law Offices****4054 McKinney Avenue****Suite 310****Dallas, TX 75204** |
| **12-30-2016** | **13-CV-2459** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Birmingham Retirement and Relief System, et al. v. S.A.C. Capital Advisors, L.P., et al.****Re Defendants:****S.A.C. Capital Advisors, L.P., S.A.C. Capital Advisors Inc., CR Intrinsic Investors, LLC, CR Intrinsic Investments, LLC, S.A.C. Capital Advisors, LLC, S.A.C. Capital Associates, LLC, S.A.C. International Equities, LLC, S.A.C. Select Fund, LLC, and Steven A. Cohen (collectively, the “Defendants” or the “SAC Capital Defendants”)**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that the SAC Capital Defendants violated Sections 10(b), 20(a), and 20(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by trading on inside information concerning the Phase 2 clinical trial of bapineuzumab (“bapi”), a potential treatment for Alzheimer’s disease under joint development by Elan and Wyeth. Among other things, theWyeth Lead Plaintiffs allege that former SAC portfolio manager Mathew Martoma obtained inside information concerning the safety and efficacy of bapi from two doctors, Sidney Gilman and Joel Ross, who oversaw and/or participated in the clinical trial, and that the SAC Capital Defendants (i) profited by acquiring shares of Wyeth common stock during the period 1-14-2008 through and including 7-18-2008, in anticipation of the announcement of favorable results of the trial, and (ii) avoided losses by disposing of their Wyeth shares during the period 7-21-2008 through and including 7-29-2008 at 4:00 p.m. EDT, when Mr. Martoma learned the results of the trial in advance of their publication. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****SCOTT+SCOTT, ATTORNEYS AT** **LAW, LLP****Deborah Clark-Weintraub****The Chrysler Building****405 Lexington Avenue****40th Floor****New York, NY 10174****212 223-6444 (Ph.)****MOTLEY RICE LLC****Gregg S. Levin****28 Bridgeside Blvd.****Mt. Pleasant, S.C. 29464****843 216-9000 (Ph.)** |
| **12-31-2016** | **15-CV-01980** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Elyse Dickerson, et al., v. Novartis Corporation and Alcon Laboratories, Inc.**Employee-plaintiffs allege that Alcon Laboratories, Inc. (“Alcon”) and Novartis Corporation (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) engaged in gender-based discrimination in pay, promotion, and assignments to jobs, compensation grades, and compensation bands against female employees who held Director-Level, Manager-Level, Specialist/Analyst-Level, or Sales Force Positions at Alcon in the U.S. The Class Period is from 3-17-2012 to Preliminary Approval Date. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or visit:****David Sanford, Esq.****Sanford Heisler** **Kimpel LLP****1350 Avenue of the** **Americas****31st Floor****New York, NY 10019****646-402-5650 (Ph.)****646-402-5651 (Fax)**[**www.sanfordheisler.com**](http://www.sanfordheisler.com) |
| **12-31-2016** | **14-CV-22982** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Marvin Bondhus, MD v. Henry Schein, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Henry Schein, Inc. (“Henry Schein”) violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq., by not including the statutorily required opt-out notice language on fax advertisements sent to customers so that they may stop receiving unwanted faxes. The Class Period is from 8-14-2010 to date of Preliminary Approval Order. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Richard Bennett****Bennett & Bennett****1200 Anastasia Avenue****Office 360****Coral Gables, FL 33134** |
| **12-31-2016** | **08-CV-05653** | **`****(S.D.N.Y.)** | **New Jersey Carpenters Health Fund v. DLJ Mortgage Capital, Inc., et al.**Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleged violations of the Securities Act against Defendants for the HEMT 2006-5 Offering in which Defendants allegedly failed to disclose that the mortgage originators systematically disregarded the applicable underwriting guidelines. The Class is described as all who purchased or otherwise acquired an interest in any Home Equity Mortgage Pass-Through Certificates issued by any of the following four HEMT trusts: Series 2006-4 (“HEMT 2006-4”), Series 2006-5 (“HEMT 2006-5”), Series 2006-6 (“HEMT 2006-6”), and Series 2007-2 (“HEMT 2007-2”). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS &** **TOLL PLLC****Joel P. Laitman****Christopher Lometti****Michael Eisenkraft****Kenneth M. Rehns****88 Pine Street****14th Floor****New York, New York 10005** |
| **12-31-2016** | **09-CV-03740** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Katz and Davidson, et al. v. Live Nation, Inc., et al.**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Live Nation charged “fees,” on tickets from Next Ticketing for events at PNC Bank Arts Center in an electronic transaction through www.etix.com after having been redirected from www.livenation.com, that violated the New Jersey Consumer Fraud Act (“CFA”), N.J.S.A. 56:8-1 et seq., and the New Jersey Truth in Consumer Contract, Warranty and Notice Act (“TCCWNA”), N.J.S.A. 56:12-14 et seq. Specifically, Plaintiffs allege that Live Nation violated the CFA and TCCWNA by adding certain fees to the price of each ticket sold through NextTicketing to events at PNC Bank Arts Center in Holmdel, NJ (“PBAC”). The Class Period is from 5-15-2006 to 19-10-2008. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or visit:****THE WOLF LAW FIRM LLC****1520 U.S. Highway 130 Suite 101****North Brunswick, NJ 08902****732 798-8055 (Ph.)****732 545-1030 (Fax)****info@wolflawfirm.net** |