| **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2-1-2016** | **12-CV-03852** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: JPMorgan Chase & Co. Securities Litigation**  On 1-19-2016, the Court issued an Order (1) preliminarily approving the settlement, (2) approving the manner and form of notice to the class and (3) scheduling the final fairness hearing regarding the settlement. For more information see CAFA Notice dated 12-22-2015. | **5-10-2016** | Prepared by Brenda Berkley  **For more information write to:**  **Bernstein Litowitz Berger**  **& Grossmann LLP**  **Salvatore J. Graziano**  **1251 Avenue of the**  **Americas**  **44th Floor**  **New York, NY 10020** |
| **2-1-2016** | **12-MD-2330** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Carrier IQ Inc. Consumer Privacy Litigation**  **Re Defendants:**  **Carrier IQ, Inc.; HTC America, Inc.; HTC Corporation; Huawei Device USA, Inc.; LG Electronics MobileComm U.S.A., Inc.; LG Electronics, Inc.; Motorola Mobility LLC;**  **Pantech Wireless, Inc.; Samsung Electronics America, Inc.; and Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.**  This lawsuit concerns software developed by Carrier iQ and installed on millions of U.S. mobile devices. Plaintiffs have alleged that the software, in addition to gathering data about cellular service quality, intercepted and transmitted private communications, content and data on these devices in violation of the Federal Wiretap Act, various state privacy and wiretap acts, various state consumer protection acts, the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, and the implied warranty of merchantability under various state laws. The Class Period is from 12-1-2007 to date of Preliminary Approval Order. | **6-25-2016** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:**  **Stephen P. DeNittis**  **Shabel & DeNittis P.C.**  **5 Greentree Centre**  **Suite 302**  **Marlton, NJ 08053**  **856 797-9951 (Ph.)**  [**sdenittis@shabeldenittis.com**](mailto:sdenittis@shabeldenittis.com) |
| **2-3-2016** | **14-CV-01316** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Bennett v. Lead Information Stream Inc., et al.**  Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Lead Information Stream, Inc. (“LIS”) violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, by using an automatic telephone dialing system (“ATDS”) to call cell phones without the prior express consent of the recipients. The lawsuit also alleges that although LeadPoint, Inc. (“LeadPoint”) did not directly make any such calls, it is vicariously liable for the calls placed by LIS because LIS placed the calls on LeadPoint’s behalf. The Class Period is from 5-28-2010 to present. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call fax or e-mail:**  **Michael Righetti**  **Matthew Righetti**  **Righetti Glugoski, PC**  **456 Montgomery Street**  **Suite 1400**  **San Francisco, CA 94104**  **(415) 983-0900 (Ph.)**  **(415) 397-9005 (Fax)**  [**mike@righettilaw.com**](mailto:mike@righettilaw.com) |
| **2-4-2016** | **13-CV-04065** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Cotter et al. v. Lyft, Inc.**  Driver-plaintiffs allege that Lyft improperly classified drivers who gave rides in California as independent contractors rather than employees and that, as a result of this classification, Lyft violated various laws and regulations. The Class is described as all current and former drivers who gave at least one ride to passengers in California between 5-25-2012 and the Preliminary Approval Date. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Matthew D. Carlson**  **CARLSON LEGAL SERVICES**  **100 Pine St., Suite 1250**  **San Francisco, CA 94111**  **510 239-4710 (Ph.)**  **Shannon Liss-Riordan**  **LICHTEN & LISS-RIORDAN,**  **P.C.**  **729 Boylston Street**  **Suite 2000**  **Boston, MA 02116**  **617-994-5800 (Ph.)** |
| **2-5-2016** | **14-CV-02349** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Digby Adler Group, et al. v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC**  Purchaser-lessor-plaintiffs allege that Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC distributed certain Sprinter Vans equipped with rear air conditioning units that allegedly would leak water into the interior of the vans. The operative complaint asserts fraud- and warranty-based claims, including claims for fraudulent concealment, violation of California’s Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act, Cal. Civil Code § 1790 et seq., violation of California’s Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civil Code § 1781 et seq., violation of California’s Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq., and violation of the New Jersey Consumer Fraud Act, N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:8-1, et seq. The Class is described as all who owned or leased a 2010-2014 model year Mercedes-Benz or Freightliner Sprinter 2500 or 3500 van with an original-equipment rear air conditioning unit. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **CHAVEZ & GERTLER LLP**  **Jonathan E. Gertler**  **42 Miller Avenue**  **Mill Valley, CA 94941**  **415 381-5599 (Ph.)**  **415 381-5572 (Fax)**  **THE VEEN FIRM P.C.**  **Anthony L. Label**  **711 Van Ness Ave**  **Suite 220**  **San Francisco, CA 94102**  **415 673-4800 (Ph.)**  **415 771-5845 (Fax)** |
| **2-5-2016** | **11-CV-1781** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Kamakahi v. American Society of Reproductive Medicine, et al.**  Donor-plaintiff alleges that the American Society for Reproductive Medicine ("ASRM") and Society for Assisted Reproductive Technology ("SART") (collectively, "Defendants") violated  § 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1, by engaging in a per se illegal horizontal price-fixing agreement among purchasers of human egg donor services. In the alternative, Plaintiff claims that the agreement is an unreasonable restraint of trade in violation of the Sherman Act under the "rule of reason." The Class Period is from 4-12-2007 to present. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Cafferty Clobes**  **Meriwether &**  **Sprengel LLP**  **1101 Market Street**  **Suite 2650**  **Philadelphia, PA 19107**  **215 864-2800 (Ph.)**    **215 864-2810 (Fax)** |
| **2-5-2016** | **14-CV-10457** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Wright, et al. v. Nationstar Mortgage, LLC**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Nationstar placed autodialed and prerecorded calls to consumers’ cellular telephones without their consent. The lawsuit alleges Nationstar violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act because consumers did not agree to receive these calls. The Class is described as all individuals in the U.S. for whom Nationstar had in its records a cellular telephone number, as of 10-14-2015. | **5-19-2016** | **For more information call or visit:**  **1 877 683-9363 (Ph.)**  [**www.automatedphonecallsettlement.com**](http://www.automatedphonecallsettlement.com) |
| **2-5-2016** | **13-CV-1531** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Joshua Skeen and Laurie Freeman, et al. v. BMW of North America, LLC**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that BMW made and sold certain MINI Coopers knowing that the cars had defective timing chain components, which are parts inside the engine. The Class is described as all who are current or former owners and lessees within the U.S. of the following MINI Cooper Models: 1) 2008-2009 MINI Cooper S Clubman (R55); 2) 2007-2009 MINI Cooper S Hardtop (R56); and 3) 2009-2010 MINI Cooper S Convertible (R57). | **5-9-2016** | **For more information write to:**  **Raymond P. Boucher**  **BOUCHER LLP**  **21600 Oxnard Street**  **Suite 600**  **Woodland Hills, CA 91367** |
|  |  |  | **Hughes v. Accretive Health, Inc., et al.**  Purchaser-plaintiff alleges that Defendants knowingly or with deliberate recklessness engaged in a scheme to manipulate the price of Accretive Health common stock. Accretive Health is a Delaware corporation with its principal executive offices located in Chicago, Illinois. During most of the Settlement Class Period, Accretive Health common stock traded on the New York Stock Exchange under the ticker symbol “ACHI.” The Class Period is from 5-20-2010 to 12-30-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Joshua L. Crowell**  **GLANCY PRONGAY &**  **MURRAY LLP**  **1925 Century Park East**  **Suite 2100**  **Los Angeles, CA 90067** |
| **2-5-2016** | **13-CV-1289** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | B**radescu, et al. Hillstone Restaurant Group, Inc.**  Employee-plaintiffs allege that Hillstone violated the California Labor Code and Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”) by failing to pay all overtime wages owing to non-exempt employees who received automatic service charges, free meals, and/or training bonuses, and who also earned overtime wages during a corresponding time period. Plaintiffs also allege that Hillstone failed to authorize and permit all rest periods to its non-exempt employees in California. Plaintiffs also allege that Hillstone failed to provide all meal periods to its non-exempt employees in California, or pay premium pay in lieu thereof. Plaintiffs also allege that Hillstone failed to adequately reimburse its non-exempt employees in California for all necessary business expenditures. Plaintiffs also allege that Hillstone failed to pay all final wages owed to its non-exempt employees in California who separated their employment with Hillstone. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiffs allege that Hillstone failed to provide accurate wage statements, and is liable for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”). The Class Period for California is from 4-5-2011 and/or elsewhere in the U.S. is from 8-22-2010 to Preliminary Approval Date. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Boren, Osher & Luftman**  **LLP**  **Paul K. Haines**  **Fletcher W. Schmidt**  **222 N. Sepulveda Blvd.**  **Suite 2222**  **El Segundo, CA 90245**  **310 322-2220 (Ph.)**  **310 322-2228 (Fax)**  [**phaines@bollaw.com**](mailto:phaines@bollaw.com)  [**fschmidt@bollaw.com**](mailto:fschmidt@bollaw.com) |
| **2-9-2016** | **13-CV-5486** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Violin Memory Securities Litigation**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933. According to the Second Amended Complaint, Defendants violated these statutes by disseminating materially untrue statements and omissions about Violin’s sales to the federal government and the professional background of the Company’s former chief executive officer, Donald G. Basile. Specifically, the Second Amended Complaint alleges that Defendants failed to disclose that Violin’s sales to the federal government had been declining and/or were likely to be negatively impacted due to federal budget constraints. Further, the Second Amended complaint alleges that Defendants failed to disclose that Mr. Basile was terminated for-cause from his prior employer, Fusion-io, Inc. When this information became public, the share price allegedly fell and shareholders were damaged. The Class is described as: all Persons who purchased or otherwise acquired shares of Violin common stock (i) in Violin’s initial public offering on 9-27-2013; and/or (ii) on the public market between 9-27-2013 and 11-21-2013 inclusive. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Nicholas I. Porritt**  **LEVI & KORSINSKY LLP**  **1101 30th Street NW**  **Washington, DC 20007** |
| **2-9-2016** | **12-CV-3419**  **15-CV-05844** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Laydon v. Mizuho Bank, Ltd., et al.**  **Sonterra Capital Master Fund, Ltd., et al. v. UBS AG, et al.**  **Re Defendants: Citigroup Inc., Citibank Japan Ltd., Citigroup Global Markets Japan Inc., and Citibank, N.A. (collectively, “Citi”)**  Security-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Citi and other banks manipulated, aided and abetted the manipulation of, and conspired, colluded, or engaged in racketeering activities to manipulate Yen-Libor, Euroyen TIBOR, and the prices of Euroyen-Based Derivatives in violation of the Commodity Exchange Act, the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, and state common law. The Class Period is from 1-1-2006 to 6-30-2011. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Nicholas I. Porritt**  **Levi & Korsinsky LLP**  **1101 30th Street, N.W., Suite 115**  **Washington, D.C. 20007**  **202 524-4290 (Ph.)** |
| **2-10-2016** | **11-CV-10344** | **(D. Mass.)** | **In re: Prograf Antitrust Litigation**  Indirect-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that  Astellas Pharma U.S., Inc. (“Astellas”) violated state antitrust, unfair competition, consumer protection, and unjust enrichment laws in Arizona, California, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, West Virginia, and/or Wisconsin (the "Class States"), by unlawfully delaying the availability of allegedly less expensive generic versions of the immunosuppressant prescription drug Prograf® (known as tacrolimus) in the United States market. The Class Period is from 4-15-2008 to 12-31-2010. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **J. Gerard Stranch, IV**  **Joe P. Leniski, Jr.**  **BRANSTETIER, STRANCH &**  **JENNINGS, PLLC**  **The Freedom Center**  **223 Rosa Parks Avenue Suite 200**  **Nashville, TN 37203**  **615 254-8801 (Ph.)** |
| **2-11-2016** | **15-CV-500** | **(E.D. Wis.)** | **Kayla Kelm v. First Associates Loan Servicing, LLC**  Consumer-plaintiff received a debt collection letter from Defendant First Associates Loan Servicing, LLC, regarding an alleged debt owed to Student CU Connect. Plaintiff alleged that the letter violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act by failing to include instructions on how the consumer can validate the debt and also stating that First Associates Loan Servicing’s offer to settle the debt for less than the full amount or reduce payments expired on a certain date. The Class is described as all natural persons, since 4-28-2014, who received an initial collection letter from First Associates Loan Servicing, LLC, which did not include instructions on how to validate the debt and also stated that the offer to reduce payments and discount balances expired on a certain date. | **6-1-2016** | **For more information write or call:**  **Shpetim Ademi**  **Denise L. Morris**  **Ademi & O’Reilly, LLP**  **3620 E. Layton Avenue**  **Cudahy, WI 53110**  **414 482-8000 (Ph.)** |
| **2-12-2016** | **14-CV-01160** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Thomas, et al. v. MagnaChip Semiconductor Corp., et al.**  **Re Defendants:**  **MagnaChip, Sang Park, Tae Young Hwang, Margaret Sakai, R. Douglas Norby, Ilbok Lee, Nader Tavakoli, Randal Klein, and Michael Elkins (collectively, the “Settling Defendants”) and defendants Barclays Capital Inc., Deutsche Bank Securities Inc., Citigroup Global Markets Inc., UBS Securities LLC and Needham & Company, LLC (collectively, the “Underwriter Defendants”)**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that the Settling Defendants and the Underwriter Defendants violated the federal securities laws by allegedly making false and misleading statements to the investing public. The Complaint alleges that during the Settlement Class Period, the Settling Defendants engaged in illicit accounting practices, including recognizing revenue for sales that never occurred and products that never shipped. The Action also alleges that non-settling defendant Avenue Capital was a controlling stockholder and major beneficiary of the accounting scheme by way of significant sales of MagnaChip Securities during the Settlement Class Period. The Class Period is from 2-1-2012 to 2-12-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Marc I. Gross**  **Michael J. Wernke**  **Pomerantz LLP**  **600 Third Avenue**  **New York, NY 10016** |
| **2-12-2016** | **14-CV-02577** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Smith, et al. v. American Greetings Corp.**  Former-employee-plaintiffs allege that American Greetings: (1) failed to pay minimum wages and overtime wages as required by California and federal law; (2) failed to pay former employees all wages due upon termination; (3) failed to provide wage statements that comply with California law; (4) failed to properly reimburse employees for work-related expenses; and (5) failed to provide meal and rest periods to employees. The lawsuit further alleges that American Greetings engaged in unfair competition by doing these things. The Class Period is from 6-4-2010 to 7-23-2015. | **5-25-2016** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Kevin F. Woodall**  **WOODALL LAW OFFICES**  **100 Pine Street**  **Suite 1250**  **San Francisco, CA 94111**  **415 413-4629 (Ph.)**  **866 937-4109 (Fax)** |
| **2-12-2016** | **14-CV-02570** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Dennis Petersen, et al. v. CJ America, Inc. d.b.a. CJ Foods Inc.**  Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that CJ America, Inc. (“CJ”) mislabeled certain Annie Chun’s products as “NO MSG ADDED,” despite the fact that the Subject Products allegedly contained ingredients that have or are known to have MSG. The Class Period is from 11-19-2012 to date of Preliminary Approval Order. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, e-mail or call:**  **Marc L. Godino**  **Glancy Prongay &**  **Murray LLP**  **1925 Century Park East**  **#2100**  **Los Angeles, CA 90067**  [**mgodino@glancylaw.com**](mailto:mgodino@glancylaw.com)  **310 201-9150 (Ph.)** |
| **2-12-2016** | **10-CV-7497** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Dodona I, LLC v. Goldman, Sachs & Co., et al.**  **Re Defendants: Goldman, Sachs & Co., The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc., Darryl K. Herrick and Peter L. Ostrem (collectively, “Defendants”)**  This lawsuit concerns the alleged conduct of the Defendants in marketing and selling Hudson CDO Notes. Investor-plaintiff claims, on behalf of itself and similarly situated investors, that Defendants violated federal and New York state law by omitting to disclose material facts concerning the risks of investing in the Hudson CDO Notes. The Court previously certified a class in this Action consisting of those who, from the initial offering through 4-27-2010, purchased or otherwise acquired Hudson CDO Notes in the United States and were damaged thereby. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Merrill G. Davidoff**  **Lawrence J. Lederer**  **Berger & Montague, P.C.**  **1622 Locust Street**  **Philadelphia, PA 19103**  **215 875-3000 (Ph.)** |
| **2-16-2016** | **12-CV-056** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Amy Jovel, et al. v. i-Health, Inc., a Delaware Corporation**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Defendant is in violation of consumer protection and warranty laws, and claim that i-Health misrepresented the efficacy of BrainStrong Products, which contained Docosahexaenoic acid (DHA) algal oil. The Class Period is from 1-1-2011 to date of Preliminary Approval Order. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:**  **Patricia N. Syverson**  **Bonnett Fairbourn Friedman & Balint, P.C.**  **2325 E. Camelback Rd.**  **Suite 300**  **Phoenix, AZ 86016**  **602 776-5925 (Ph.)**  [**psyverson@bffb.com**](mailto:psyverson@bffb.com) |
| **2-17-2016** | **15-CV-00857** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **In re: Associated Estates Realty Corporation Shareholder Litigation**  Anne Cutler (“Cutler”) filed a putative class and shareholder derivative action styled Cutler v. Friedman, et al. No. 1:15-cv-00857-DCN, in federal court (the “Cutler Action”), naming Associated Estates as a nominal defendant and alleging, among other things, that the Director Defendants had breached their state law fiduciary duties to Associated Estates shareholders in connection with a merger, and that the Brookfield Defendants had aided and abetted the alleged breaches (Associated Estates and the Director Defendants together, the “Associated Estates Defendants,” and collectively with the Brookfield Defendants, the “Defendants”). Several days later, on 5-12-2015, plaintiff Brent Berkman (“Berkman”) (Berkman and Cutler collectively being the “Federal Plaintiffs”) filed a similar putative class and shareholder derivative action styled Berkman v. Friedman, et al., 1:15-cv-00928, in federal court (the “Berkman Action”) (the Berkman Action and the Cutler Action collectively being the “Federal Actions”), also naming Associated Estates as a nominal defendant and alleging, among other things, that the Director Defendants had breached their state law fiduciary duties to Associated Estates shareholders in connection with a merger, and that the Brookfield Defendants had aided and abetted the alleged breaches. The Class Period is from 6-3-2014 to 8-7-2015. | **6-8-2016** | **For more information write to:**  **Stephen J. Oddo**  **ROBBINS ARROYO LLP**  **600 B Street**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101**  **Richard A. Acocelli**  **WEISSLAW LLP**  **1500 Broadway, 16th Floor**  **New York, NY 10036**  **Andrew S. Goldwasser**  **CIANO & GOLDWASSER,**  **L.L.P.**  **1610 Midland Building**  **101 Prospect Avenue, West**  **Cleveland, OH 44115** |
| **2-17-2016** | **10-CV-7497** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Dodona I, LLC v. Goldman, Sachs & Co., et al.**  **Re Defendants: Goldman, Sachs & Co., The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc., Darryl K. Herrick and Peter L. Ostrem (collectively, “Defendants”)**  Supplemental Notice – The Court has scheduled a final approval hearing. For more information see CAFA Notice dated 2-12-2016 above. | **6-17-2016** | **For more information write or call:**  **Merrill G. Davidoff, Esq.**  **Lawrence J. Lederer, Esq.**  **Berger & Montague, P.C.**  **1622 Locust Street**  **Philadelphia, PA 19103**  **215 875-3000 (Ph.)** |
| **2-18-2016** | **10-MD-2143** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Optical Disk Drive Products Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendants: NEC Corporation (“NEC”), Panasonic Corporation and Panasonic Corporation of North America (collectively, “Panasonic”)**  Indirect-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that certain companies engaged in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, or stabilize the price of Optical Disk Drive Products at artificially high levels in violation of federal and state antitrust laws. The Class is described as: All persons and entities who, as residents of Arizona, California, District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia and Wisconsin and during the period April 2003 to December 2008, purchased new for their own use and not for resale: (i) a computer with an internal ODD; (ii) a stand-alone ODD designed for internal use in computers; or (iii) an ODD designed to be attached externally to a computer. ODD refers to a DVD-RW, DVD-ROM, or COMBO drive manufactured by one or more Defendants or their co-conspirators. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Steve W. Berman**  **Hagens Berman Sobol**  **Shapiro LLP**  **1918 Eighth Avenue**  **Suite 3300**  **Seattle, WA 98101**  **www.OpticalDiskDriveAntitrust.com** |
| **2-18-2016** | **12-CV-07065** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **Schuylkill Health System, et al. v. Cardinal Health 200, LLC, et al.**  Provides notice that the proposed class action settlement with Plaintiffs Schuylkill Health System, Titusville Area Hospital, and Warren General Hospital, was filed with the Court in the above-captioned matter. For more information see CAFA Notice dated 10-26-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Brent W. Landau**  **Hausfeld LLP**  **325 Chestnut Street**  **Suite 900**  **Philadelphia, PA 19106** |
| **2-18-2016** | **15-CV-175** | **(W.D.N.C.)** | **Davis, et al. v Merrill Lync & Co., Inc., et al.**  Employee-plaintiffs allege that during their employment, they earned awards under four contingent deferred compensation plans: the Financial Advisor Capital Accumulation Award Plan, the Growth Award Plan, the WealthBuilder Account Plan, and the Long-Term Incentive Compensation Plan for Managers and Producers (collectively, the “Plans”). In addition to the Plans, Plaintiffs allege that they received monthly bonus payments based upon the Advisor Transition Program (“ATP”), which was the retention program Merrill Lynch provided to selected employees after its merger with Bank of America. The Settlement resolves a lawsuit over whether these former Merrill Lynch employees whose employment with Merrill Lynch was involuntarily terminated following a Change in Control are entitled to receive certain amounts under one or more of the Plans and/or ATP. Plaintiffs allege that the Plans and ATP contain provisions in their governing documents which specifically outline the procedure and actions that must be taken by Merrill Lynch in order to deny Plaintiffs’ compensation and benefits on the basis that Plaintiffs were terminated for “Cause.” Plaintiffs also allege that Merrill Lynch failed to follow the contractual requirements of the Plans and ATP in this regard and that, therefore, Plaintiffs’ terminations were not for “Cause,” and Plaintiffs are thus entitled to their Plans balances and ATP Bonus Payments. The Class is described as all individuals who are or were employed by Merrill Lynch in the U.S. who: (a) were employed by Merrill Lynch on 9-15-2008; (b) participated in one or more of the Plans and/or the ATP; (c) are either currently employed with Merrill Lynch or were involuntarily terminated from employment by Merrill Lynch between 4-20-2009 and the present; (d) currently have or at the time of their termination had unvested awards in one or more of the Plans and/or remaining ATP payments; and (e) were not paid their account balances in the  Plans for awards made for production year 2008 and prior, or the remaining ATP monthly bonus payments pursuant to the ATP and its Amendment. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Michael S. Taaffe, Esq.**  **Michael D. Bressan, Esq.**  **Jarrod J. Malone, Esq.**  **Shumaker, Loop &**  **Kendrick, LLP**  **240 South Pineapple Ave. 10th Floor**  **Sarasota, Florida 34236**  **941 364-2720 (** |
| **2-18-2016** | **13-CV-04460** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Good Morning To You Productions Corp., et al. v. Warner/Chappell Music, Inc., et al.**  Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that the Defendants and the Intervenors do not own, and never owned, a copyright to the Song’s words and music. The Plaintiffs have asserted claims that the Defendants must reimburse everyone who has paid for the Song since 9-3-1949. The claims that are subject to this Settlement are identified in Plaintiff’s Fifth Amended Complaint and in the Settlement Agreement. The Class is described as: (a) all Persons who, at any time since 9-3-1949, directly paid Defendants, Intervenors, any of their predecessors-in-interest (or any of the Affiliates of any of the foregoing) for each such Person’s use of the Song; (b) all Persons who directly paid Harry Fox Agency, Inc. (“HFA”), Alfred or Faber as agents for Defendants or their predecessors-in-interest for each such Person’s use of the Song; or (c) the American Society of Composers and Songwriters (ASCAP), foreign collecting societies (such as, for example, SACEM and GEMA), and any other Person who at any time since 9-3-1949 has issued blanket licenses covering the Song, but only for the amounts allocated to the Song by such Persons and directly paid to Defendants or their predecessors-in-interest (or either’s Affiliates) pursuant to such blanket licenses. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER**  **FREEMAN & HERZ LLP**  **Attention**  **Betsy C. Manifold**  **750 B Street**  **Suite 2770**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **2-18-2016** | **10-MD-02143** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re Optical Disk Drive Product**  The Court scheduled a Fairness Hearing on 4-14-2016 for final approval of Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs’ settlements with seven Defendants groups: (1) BenQ Corp.l and BenQ America Corp. (collectively, “BenQ”); (2) Pioneer Corp.; Pioneer North America, Inc; Pioneer Electronics (USA) Inc. and Pioneer High Fidelity Taiwan Co., Ltd. I(collectively, “Pioneer”); (3) Knoinklijke Philips Electronics N.V.; Lite-On Digital Solutions Corp.; and Philips & Lite-On Digital Solutions USA, Inc. (collectively, “PLDS”); (4) Quanta Storage Inc. and Quanta; Storage American, Inc. (collectively, “QSI”); (5) Sony Corp.; Sony Optiarc, Inc.; Sony Optiarc American, Inc.; Sony NEC Optiarc Inc.; and Sony Electronics, Inc. ; (6) TEAC Corp. and TEAC America, Inc. (collectively, “TEAC”); and (7) Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.; Samsung Electronics America, Inc.; Toshiba Corp.; Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc.; Toshiba Samsung Storage Technology Corp.; and Toshiba Samsung Storage Technology Korea Corp. (collectively, “TSST”). For more information see CAFA Notice dated 2-18-2016. | **4-14-2016** | **For more information write, e-mail or visit:**  **Jeff D. Friedman**  **Shanan E. Scarlett**  **715 Hearst Avenue**  **Suite 202**  **Berkeley, CA 94710**  [**jeff@hbsslaw.com**](mailto:jeff@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**  [**www.OpticalDiskDriveAntitrust.com**](http://www.OpticalDiskDriveAntitrust.com) |
| **2-18-2016** | **05-CV-02367** | **(D.N.J.)** | **In re: Merck & Co., Inc. Securities, Derivative & ERISA Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. and Merck & Co., Inc., the named defendant in this action, together with any of their subsidiaries and affiliates, (“Merck”), Dr. Alise S. Reicin and Dr. Edward M. Scolnick (collectively, “Defendants”)**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege misrepresentations and omissions in public statements by Merck and the Individual Defendants concerning Merck’s prescription painkiller, Vioxx. Vioxx was manufactured and sold by Merck from 5-21-1999, following its approval by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for marketing in accordance with FDA approved labeling, until 9-30-2004, when Merck voluntarily withdrew Vioxx from the market. In late 2003 and in 2004 numerous putative securities fraud class actions concerning statements made by one or more of the Defendants about Vioxx were filed in various federal courts across the country. The Class Period is from 5-21-1999 to 10-29-2004. | **6-28-2016** | **For more information write to:**  **Salvatore J. Graziano**  **Bernstein Litowitz Berger**  **& Grossmann LLP**  **1251 Ave. of the Americas**  **New York, NY 10020**  **David A.P. Brower**  **Brower Piven**  **A Professional Corp.**  **475 Park Avenue South, 33rd Floor**  **New York, NY 10016**  **Robert A. Wallner**  **Milberg LLP**  **One Pennsylvania Plaza**  **New York, NY 10119** |
| **2-19-2016** | **13-MD-02420** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litigation**  **Re: Defendants: Sony Corporation, Sony Energy Devices Corporation, and Sony Electronics Inc. (“Sony”)**  Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendants and co—conspirators engaged in an unlawful conspiracy to fix, raise, maintain or stabilize the prices of Lithium Ion Battery Cells (“Li-Ion Cells”). Plaintiffs further claim that direct purchasers from the Defendants of Li-Ion Batteries and Li-Ion Products may recover for the effect that the conspiracy had on the prices of these devices. Plaintiffs allege that, as a result of the unlawful conspiracy involving Li-Ion Cells, they and other direct purchasers paid more for Li-Ion Batteries and Li-Ion Products than they would have paid absent the conspiracy. The Class Period is from 1-1-2000 to 5-31-2011. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **R. Alexander Saveri**  **Geoffrey C. Rushing**  **Saveri & Saveri, Inc.**  **706 Sansome Street**  **San Francisco, CA 94111**  **Bruce L. Simon**  **Pearson, Simon & Warshaw,**  **LLP**  **44 Montgomery Street**  **Suite 2450**  **San Francisco, CA 94104**  **Joseph J. Tabacco**  **Berman Bevalerio**  **One California Street**  **Suite 900**  **San Francisco, CA 94111** |
| **2-19-2016** | **15-CV-80415** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Gilbert, et al. v. SunTrust Banks, Inc.**  Employee-plaintiffs allege that Defendant SunTrust Banks, Inc. (“SunTrust”) violated the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”), as amended by the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (“COBRA”). As set forth below, SunTrust, the plan sponsor of the SunTrust Health Plan (“Plan”), has repeatedly violated ERISA by failing to provide participants and beneficiaries in the Plan with adequate notice, as prescribed by COBRA, of their right to continue their health coverage upon the occurrence of a “qualifying event” as defined by the statute. As a result of these violations, which threaten Class Members’ ability to maintain their health coverage, Plaintiffs seek statutory penalties, injunctive relief, attorneys’ fees , costs and expenses, and other appropriate relief as set forth herein and provided by law. The Class Period is from 1-1-2014 to 1-6-2016. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Kai H. Richter**  **Nichols Kaster PLLP**  **4600 IDS Center**  **80 South Eighth Street**  **Minneapolis, MN 55402** |
| **2-19-2016** | **14-CV-05615** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Philliben, et al. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.**  **Re Defendants: Uber Technologies, Inc. and Rasier, LLC**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Uber made misrepresentations or omissions regarding the “Safe Rides Fee,” safety measures, and the background check process for potential drivers. The lawsuit asserts a number of causes of action including Breach of Implied Contract, alleged violations of California’s Consumers Legal Remedies Act (Cal. Civ. Code § 1750 et seq.), California’s Unfair Competition Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.), California’s False Advertising Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code 17500 et seq.), and other violations of law. The Class Period is from 1-1-2013 to 1-31-2016. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Robert R. Ahdoot**  **Tina Wolfson**  **Ahdoot & Wolfson, PC**  **1016 Palm Avenue**  **West Hollywood, CA 90069**  **Mike Arias**  **Alfredo Torrijos**  **Arias, Sanguinetti, Stahle & Torrijos, LLP**  **6701 Center Drive West**  **14th Floor**  **Los Angeles, CA 90045**  **Nicholas Coulson**  **Liddle & Dubin, P.C.**  **975 E. Jefferson Avenue**  **Detroit, MI 48207** |
| **2-19-2016** | **14-CV-00081** | **(D. Md.)** | **Fangman, et al. v. Genuine Title, LLC, et al. Note: CAFA notice relating to a proposed class action settlement of claims asserted against Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. and Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, Inc.**  Borrower-plaintiffs allege that certain Wells Fargo employees participated in the Alleged Referral Scheme, which the Plaintiffs contend violated certain federal and state laws and negatively impacted those borrowers who were referred to Genuine Title. The Plaintiffs also contend that Wells Fargo should be held responsible for the conduct of those employees who allegedly accepted unlawful benefits from Genuine Title in exchange for an agreement to refer borrowers to Genuine Title. The Class Period is from 1-1-2009 to 12-31-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**  [**WWW.GENUINETITLEWFSETTLEMENT.COM**](http://WWW.GENUINETITLEWFSETTLEMENT.COM) |
| **2-22-2016** | **14-CV-6046** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Penn West Petroleum Ltd. Securities Litigation**  Investor-plaintiff alleges that, during the 2-18-2010 to 7-29-2014 putative class period (the “Settlement Class Period”), Defendants made false or misleading statements concerning Penn West’s finances, in an attempt to influence the market’s perception of Penn West’s financial health and long-term viability. The Action was brought by Lead Plaintiffs on behalf of a putative class of investors who purchased or otherwise acquired Penn West common stock or trust units or Penn West call options, or sold or wrote Penn West put options, on an open market located within the U.S. during the Settlement Class Period. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Bernstein Litowitz Berger**  **& Grossmann LLP**  **John Rizio-Hamilton**  **1251 Avenue of the**  **Americas**  **44th Floor**  **New York, NY 10020**  **Glancy Prongay &**  **Murray LLP**  **Peter A. Binkow**  **1925 Century Park East**  **Suite 2100**  **Los Angeles, CA 90067** |
| **2-25-2016** | **14-CV-01149** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Schuler v. The Medicines Company, et al.**  Investor-plaintiff alleges that Defendants made false and misleading statements about the drug cangrelor, the conduct and results of its final clinical trial, and its prospects for FDA approval. Lead Plaintiff further alleges that investors were harmed on 2-10-2014, when the FDA released Briefing Documents criticizing the cangrelor drug trial and on 2-12-2014, when the FDA advisory panel voted to recommend against approving cangrelor. Plaintiff also asserts claims under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Securities and Exchange Commission Rule 10b-5. The Class Period is from 1-8-2013 to 2-12-2014. | **6-7-2016** | **For more information write to:**  **Jeremy A. Lieberman**  **POMERANTZ LLP**  **600 Third Avenue**  **20th Floor**  **New York, NY 10016** |
| **2-26-2016** | **14-CV-06913** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Heidbreder Building Group, LLC, et al v. Association of the Wall and Ceiling Industry, et al.**  Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Wall and Ceiling Industry (“AWCI” or “Defendant”) sent unsolicited facsimile advertisements promoting its goods or services for sale, and that the advertisements did not contain an opt out notice as described in the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. § 227. Plaintiff alleges that the sending of these faxes violated the TCPA, the Illinois Consumer Fraud Act and Illinois common law (conversion, trespass to chattels, and private nuisance). The Class Period is from 9-8-2009 to 9-8-2014. | **6-28-2016** | **For more information write, call fax or visit:**  **Edelman, Combs,**  **Latturner, & Goodwin,**  **LLC (30273)**  **20 S. Clark St., Suite 1500, Chicago, IL 60603**  **312 739-4200 (Ph.)**  **312 419-0379 (Fax)**  [**www.edcombs.com**](http://www.edcombs.com) |
| **2-26-2016** | **14-CV-00367** | **(D. Or.)** | **In re: Galena Biopharma, Inc. Securities Litigation**  Purchaser-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 July 2013, Galena paid promoters – Non-Settling Defendants Dream Team Group LLC, Thomas Meyer, 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. | **6-23-2016** | **For more information visit or write:**  [**www.galenasecuritieslitigation.com**](http://www.galenasecuritieslitigation.com)  **Rosen Law Firm, P.A. 275 Madison Avenue, 34th Floor**  **New York, NY 10016** |
| **2-26-2016** | **13-CV-06156** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Derek Terry v. TMX Finance LLC and TitleMax of Illinois, Inc.**  Employee-plaintiff alleges that TMX Finance LLC and TitleMax of Illinois, Inc. violated the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”), 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq., by not paying overtime wages to general managers in training for hours worked over 40 in a workweek. Plaintiff also seeks to bring his claim for violation of the Illinois Minimum Wage Law (“IMWL”), 820 Ill. Com. Stat. 105/1, as a state-wide class action. The Class Period is from 6-1-2011 to 1-10-2013. | **6-7-2016** | **For more information write to:**  **Timothy J. Becker**  **David Grounds**  **Johnson Becker, PLLC**  **33 South Sixth Street**  **Suite 4530**  **Minneapolis, MN 55402** |
| **2-26-2016** | **14-CV-03191** | **(D. Md.)** | **Kevin Martin v. Fair Collections and Outsourcing, Inc.**  Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to comply with the federal Fair Credit Reporting Act by requiring job applicants to sign standardized disclosure and application forms which did not consist solely of the disclosure that a consumer report may be obtained for employment purposes. The Class Period is from 10-10-2009 to 10-10-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Francis & Mailman, P.C.**  **100 S. Broad Street**  **Suite 1902**  **Philadelphia, PA 19110** |
| **2-26-2016** | **6-MD-01775** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Air China Limited and Air China Cargo Company, Ltd. (hereinafter “Air China”)**  Indirect-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Air China conspired to unlawfully fix prices of airfreight shipping services worldwide, including on cargo shipments to, from and within the U.S., by among other things, concertedly levying agreed-upon, artificially inflated surcharges, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act. 15 U.S.C. § 1. The Class Period is from 1-1-2000 to 9-30-2006. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Howard J. Sedran**  **Austin B. Cohen**  **Keith J. Verrier**  **Levin, Fishbein,**  **Sedran & Berman**  **510 Walnut Street**  **Philadelphia, PA 19105**  **215 592-1500 (Ph.)** |