| **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name**  **Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **Website Link** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1-2-2015** | **13-CV-02289** | **(M.D. Pa.)** | **Demchak Partners Limited Partnership v. Chesapeake Appalachia, L.L.C.**  Plaintiffs-Intervenors claim that Chesapeake underpays royalties relating to gas produced from wells located in Pennsylvania pursuant to certain provisions of oil and gas leases. The Lawsuit alleges that Chesapeake inappropriately deducted from royalties certain costs that Chesapeake was not permitted to deduct under its leases pursuant to royalty clauses often referred to as “Market Enhancement Clauses” and sold gas at prices that were less than true market value prices. Plaintiffs asked Chesapeake to pay monetary damages and prejudgment interest. The Class Period is from 6-1-2014 to the Effective Date of the Settlement. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Larry D. Moffett**  **Daniel Coker Horton &**  **Bell, P.A.**  **P.O. Box 1396**  **Oxford, MS 38655-1396** |
| **1-5-2015** | **08-MD-2002** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **In re Processed Egg Products Antitrust Litigation (NuCal and Hillandale/Gettysburg Settlements)**  Direct-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that this supply conspiracy limited, fixed, raised, stabilized, or maintained the price of eggs, which caused direct purchasers to pay more for eggs than they would have otherwise paid. The term “Eggs” refers to both Shell Eggs and Egg Products (which are eggs removed from their shells for further processing into a dried, frozen, or liquid form), but do not include specialty Shell Eggs, such as cage-free, organic, or nutritionally enhanced eggs, eggs used for growing, or Egg Products produced from such eggs. The Class Period is from 1-1-2000 to Date of Preliminary Approval. | **6-22-2015**  Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **Steven A. Asher**  **Weinstein Kitchenoff &**  **Asher LLC**  **1845 Walnut Street**  **Suite 1100**  **Philadelphia, PA 19103** |
| **1-7-2015** | **06-MD-01775** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation (Nippon Cargo Airlines Co., Ltd. (“NCA”))**  Direct-purchaser-plaintiffs’ action arises from Defendants’ massive, global conspiracy to fix, raise, maintain, or stabilize prices of Airfreight Shipping Services through a number of mechanisms, including, inter alia, concertedly levying inflated surcharges, jointly agreeing to eliminate or prevent discounting of Airfreight Shipping Services prices, agreeing on yields and allocating customers. The Class Period is from 1-1-2000 to present. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write, call or fax:**  **Hollis L. Salzman**  **Robins, Kaplan,**  **Miller & Ciresi**  **601 Lexington Avenue**  **Suite 3400**  **New York, NY 10022**  **212 980-7400 (Ph.)**  **212 980-7499 (Fax)** |
| **1-7-2015** | **09-CV-153** | **(D.R.I.)** | **Isabel S. Cohen v. Rhode Island Turnpike & Bridge Authority (RITBA)**  Purchaser-plaintiff alleges that when RITBA instituted its RIEZ-Pass Discount Plan, Rhode Island residents who paid the Newport Bridge toll with a Rhode Island transponder were charged $0.83 per crossing and non-Rhode Island residents with otherwise identical vehicles were charged $1.75 per crossing (2.11 times more than the Rhode Island resident toll rate). The Complaint alleges that the difference in toll rates violated the U.S. Constitution because RITBA restricted participation in the RIEZ-Pass Discount Plan solely to Rhode Island residents. The Class Period is from 12-16-2008 to 4-7-2011. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Stull, Stull & Brody**  **Jules Brody**  **Patrick Slyne**  **6 East 45th Street**  **New York, NY 10017**  **212 687-7230 (Ph.)**  **212 490-2022 (Fax)**  [**jbrody@ssbny.com**](mailto:jbrody@ssbny.com)  [**pkslyne@ssbny.com**](mailto:pkslyne@ssbny.com) |
| **1-8-2015** | **12-CV-01137** | **(M.D. Tenn.)** | **Carolyn Lynn, et al. v. Arthur F. Helf, et al.** Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Tennessee Commerce Bancorp, Inc. (“TNCC” or the “Company”) and certain of its executives violated the federal securities laws by, among other things, misrepresenting its allowance for loan and lease losses, internal controls and reported net income in an effort to misrepresent and conceal the Company’s true financial condition and failing to comply with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. Lead Plaintiff alleges that the settling Defendants disclosed the truth about the company’s financial results through a series of partial corrective disclosures, and the Class Members suffered damages as a result of the inflation and/or decline in the price of TNCC common stock. The Class Period is from 4-18-2008 to 1-27-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Wolf Haldenstein Adler**  **Freeman & Herz LLP**  **Peter C. Harrar**  **270 Madison Avenue**  **New York, NY 10016** |
| **1-8-2015** | **12-CV-01332** | **(S.D. Tex.)** | **In re: Houston American Energy Corp. (HUSA) Securities Litigation**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that HUSA, and certain of its officers and directors, violated the federal securities laws by issuing false and misleading statements regarding the amount of recoverable oil reserves in the CPO4 drilling block (in which the Company owned a substantial interest), as well as the success of the Company’s oil drilling efforts in that region. The Class Period is from 1-8-2009 to 4-18-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:**  **Murielle Steven Walsh**  **Star M. Tyner**  **Pomerantz LLP**  **600 Third Avenue**  **20th Floor**  **New York, NY 10016**  [**mjsteven@pomlaw.com**](mailto:mjsteven@pomlaw.com) |
| **1-9-2015** | **13-CV-10686** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Michael Courtney v. Avid Technology, et al.**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that (i) Avid improperly recognized revenues it generated from various software updates, which included, among other things, enhancement bug fixes and compatibility extensions; (ii) Avid improperly manipulated accounting reserves associated with its restructuring initiative throughout the Class Period in order to inflate its earnings; (iii) Avid also failed to disclose that its centralized sales structure in Europe was not working and that its scheme to increase prices in order to offset sales was equally ineffective; and (iv) Avid’s external auditor, Ernst & Young LLP, issued false audit options concerning Avid’s financial statements. The Class Period is from 10-23-2008 to 2-24-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Jeremy A. Lieberman**  **Pomerantz LLP**  **600 Third Avenue**  **New York, NY 10016**  **Ellen Gusikoff Stewart**  **Robbins Geller Rudman &**  **Dowd LLP**  **655 West Broadway**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **1-14-2015** | **14-CV-00082** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **Tyrone B. Henderson, Sr., et al. v. AlliedBarton Security Services LLC. d/b/a HR Plus**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that AlliedBarton violated certain provisions of the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681, et seq. (“FCRA”), in connection with AlliedBarton’s publication of consumer reports. The lawsuit was filed on behalf of consumers residing in the U.S. who applied for employment subject to a background check, which is a consumer report under the FCRA. At the time of this action, Defendant was a consumer reporting agency and a reseller of consumer data that supplied consumer reports about class members to employers. The lawsuit raised two sets of claims – individual claims and class claims. The individual claims pertained solely to the inaccuracy within the Named Plaintiffs’ consumer reports. Those claims were settled by separate agreement on an individual basis. The lawsuit also alleges several class claims alleging that AlliedBarton violated the FCRA by failing to provide certain timely notices required under the FCRA. The Class Period is from 2-6-2012 to 9-30-2013. | **1-15-2015** | **For more information write to:**  **Susan M. Rotkis**  **Consumer Litigation**  **Associates, P.C.**  **763 J. Clyde Morris Blvd.**  **Suite 1A**  **Newport News, VA 23601**  **Dale Wood Pittman**  **112-A West Tabb Street**  **Petersburg, VA 23803**  **Jeremiah A. Denton III**  **Law Offices of Jeremiah**  **A. Denton III, P.C.**  **Pinehurst Center**  **477 Viking Drive**  **Suite 100**  **Virginia Beach, VA 23452** |
| **1-16-2015** | **11-CV-4521**  **11-CV-6087**  **11-CV-5519**  **12-CV-00601** | **(S.D.N.Y.)**  **(D. Nev.)** | **Segal, et al. v. Bitar, et al.**  **Lawson v. Full Tilt Poker LTD**  **Jetha, et al. v. Filco, LTD., et al.**  **Segal v. Lederer, et al.**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Defendants executed a scheme involving the Full Tilt Poker online gaming enterprise whereby they accepted player deposits in contravention of federal gambling laws through the use of shell corporations and then, despite repeated statements and representations to the contrary, intermingling the player funds with company and private accounts. On 4-15-2011, or Black Friday, the U.S. Department of Justice seized the assets of Full Tilt Poker and, as a result, player accounts were frozen. Days later, the U.S. Department of Justice permitted Full Tilt Poker use of its domain for the purpose of redistributing player funds; however, unlike other affected online gaming enterprises, Full Tilt Poker did not redistribute player funds. On 9-21-2011, it was alleged in the U.S. Departmentof Justice’s amended complaint that Full Tilt Poker had operated as a Ponzi scheme, intermingling player funds with company operational accounts for the purpose of paying Defendants and Full Tilt Poker related entities, executivesand shareholders. Based on these allegations and evidence, along with press reports and their own counsel’s research and investigation, Plaintiffs alleged that Full Tilt Poker, its related entities and certain of its executives and officers had misled the Class, funneled the funds from Player Accounts through improper channels, including shell companies used to mislead payment processors, enriching themselves and others to the detriment of the Class. Plaintiffs alleged in the Actions causes of action for violations of Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, breach of contract and conversion. The Class Members are all who had monies in a Full Tilt Poker Player Account on 4-15-2011, and subsequently were unable to access the monies from the Full Tilt Poker Player Account. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Thomas H. Burt**  **Wolf Haldenstein Adler**  **Freeman & Herz LLP**  **270 Madison Avenue**  **New York, NY 10016**  **212 545-4600 (Ph.)** |
| **1-16-2015** | **10-CV-0699** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Kelton Davis, William Turner, Edwin Larregui, Roman Jackson, Kristin Johnson, Eleanor Britt, Anthony Anderson, LaShaun Smith, Shawne Jones, Hector Suarez, Adam Cooper, Andrew Washington, Patrick Littlejohn, David Wilson, Geneva Wilson, Raymond Osorio, Vaughn Frederick, and Rikia Evans v. The City of New York and New York City Housing Authority**  Resident-plaintiffs claim that New York City Police implemented an unlawful vertical patrol and trespass arrest policy resulting in a pattern and practice of illegal stops, seizures, questionings, searches, detainments and false arrests of residents and invited visitors to New York City Housing Authority (“NYCHA”) residences. No monetary damages are proposed under this settlement. The settlement revises the NYCPD patrol guide that instructs its officers how to conduct interior/vertical patrols of NYCHA residences in a manner that respects the rights of NYCHA residents and their authorized visitors, and clarifies the prohibited activities of “lingering” in common areas of NYCHA residences. The Class Period is from 1-28-2007 to present. | **4-22-2015** | **For more information write to:**  **Janai Nelson**  **Christina Swarns**  **Jin Hee Lee**  **Rachel Kleinman**  **NAACP Legal Defense and**  **Educational Fund, Inc.**  **40 Ractor Street**  **5th Floor**  **New York, NY 10006**  **Seymour James**  **Attorney-in-Chief**  **William Gibney**  **Steven Wasserman**  **The Legal Aid Society of**  **New York**  **199 Water Street**  **6th Floor**  **New York, NY 10038** |
| **1-20-2015** | **12-CV-8794** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Scott Ernst v. DISH Network, LLC, DISH Network Service, LLC and Sterling Infosystems, Inc.**  Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Sterling violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) by including non-convictions older than seven years on its consumer reports. Plaintiff has alleged that Sterling violated the FCRA by including motor vehicle record information that did not result in a conviction, which was older than seven years, on its consumer reports. On behalf of Class III, Plaintiff has alleged that Sterling violated the FCRA by providing consumer reports to DISH, without DISH having a permissible purpose to receive the reports. Based on these allegations, Plaintiffs seeks statutory damages. The Class Members are of three classes of consumers for whom Sterling issued a consumer report on or after 12-4-2010: Class I – Criminal Record Settlement Class; Class II – Motor Vehicle Record Settlement Class; and Class III – DISH Contractor Settlement. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **E. Michelle Drake**  **Nichols Kaster, PLLP**  **4600 IDS Center**  **80 South 8th Street**  **Minneapolis, MN 55402**  **1 877 448-0492** |
| **1-21-2015** | **14-CV-02177** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Dr. William P. Gress and Al and Po Corporation, et al. v. Premier Healthcare Exchange West (PHX West), Inc.**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that they received unsolicited facsimile advertisements sent by PHX West promoting its goods or services for sale. Plaintiffs further complain that the faxes in question did not contain an opt-out notice as required by the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227. Plaintiffs alleged that the sending of these faxes violated the TCPA, the Illinois Consumer Fraud Act and Illinois common law (conversion, private nuisance, and trespass to chattels). The Class Period is from 1-23-2010 to 3-27-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Edelman, Combs, Latturner**  **& Goodwin, LLC**  **20 S. Clark Street**  **Suite 1500**  **Chicago, IL 60603**  **312 739-4200 (Ph.)**  [**www.edcombs.com**](http://www.edcombs.com) |
| **1-21-2015** | **10-CV-00864** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Waterford Township Police & Fire Retirement System v. Smithtown Bancorp, Inc., et al.**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege, in the Second Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint (the “SAC”) filed on 4-30-2013 against Defendants SBI, People’s United Financial, Inc. (as successor to SBI), (collectively, “People’s United”), Bradley E. Rock and Anita M. Florek, among other things, that during the Class Period, Smithtown Bancorp, Inc. (SBI) engaged in a variety of unsafe and/or unsound banking practices, which rendered SBI unable to timely identify and monitor past due loans with emerging credit weaknesses, and loans in violation of bank policy. Lead Plaintiffs further alleged that SBI failed to calculate or maintain its allowance for loan and lease losses (“ALLL”) in conformity with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, materially overstated its operating results and fostered a materially misleading impression about the true state of SBI’s financial well-being. The SAC asserts that these allegedly false and misleading statements and omissions artificially inflated the price of SBI common stock. The Class Period is from 3-13-2008 to 2-1-2010. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Ellen Gusikoff Stewart**  **Robbins Geller Rudman &**  **Dowd LLP**  **655 West Broadway**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101**  **Samuel H. Rudman**  **Evan J. Kaufman**  **Robbins Geller Rudman &**  **Dowd LLP**  **58 South Service Road**  **Suite 200**  **Melville, NY 11747** |
| **1-21-2015** | **11-CV-02142** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Manuel Gonzalez, et al. v. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, Inc., et al.**  Loan Officer-plaintiffs allege that all current or former Loan Officers who worked for Defendants violated the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”), the New Jersey Wage and Hour Law (“NJWHL”) and the New Jersey Wage Payment Law (“NJWPL”) by improperly designating Loan Officers as “exempt” from overtime pay. The lawsuit seeks overtime pay and other relief on behalf of these Loan Officers. The Class Period is from 4-14-2009 to 3-26-2011. | **5-18-2015** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:**  **Molly A. Elkin**  **Woodley & McGillivary,**  **LLP**  **1101 Vermont Avenue, N.W.**  **Suite 1000**  **Washington, DC 20006**  **202 833-8855 (Ph.)** |
| **1-22-2015** | **13-CV-00662** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **Rita M. Wyatt, et al. v. Early Warning Services, LLC (EWS), et al.**  Consumer-plaintiffs allege that SunTrust violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act and is liable to a nationwide class of persons who were the subject of a consumer report that was used by SunTrust to make an employment decision of either rejection or termination of employment and who were not provided a copy of the consumer report and/or the disclosure required by 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b) at least five business days before the employment decision. In addition plaintiffs allege that SunTrust is also liable to a nationwide sub-class of persons who were the subject of a Consumer Report form that was used by EWS to adjudicate and score a consumer’s eligibility for employment subsequent to 5-1-2012, for whom EWS’s decision was other than “proceed” or a comparable adjudication result indicating no incident information, and for whom SunTrust rejected or terminated the consumer’s employment application or employment. The Class Period is from 9-27-2011 to 12-31-2013. | **5-21-2015** | **For more information write to:**  **Leonard A. Bennett**  **Susan M. Rotkis**  **Consumer Litigation**  **Associates, P.C.**  **763 J Clyde Morris Blvd**  **Suit 1-A**  **Newport News, VA 23601** |
| **1-22-2015** | **13-CV-00183** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **In re: Star Scientific, Inc. Securities Litigation**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements regarding Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine’s purported involvement in pre-clinical and clinical studies of Star Scientific’s main product, Anatabloc®. Lead Plaintiff also alleges that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements about the regulatory status of Star Scientific’s two products Anatabloc® and CigRx®. Lead Plaintiff claims that as a result of these alleged false and misleading statements, the market price of Star Scientific’s common stock was artificially and improperly inflated. The Class Period is from 5-10-2011 to 9-12-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Robbins Arroyo LLP**  **Stephen J. Oddo**  **600 B Street**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **1-23-2015** | **06-CV-02376** | **(E.D. Cal.)** | **Jason Campbell and Sarah Sobek v. PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) LLP**  Employee-plaintiffs allege that PwC misclassified them and the other Class Members as exempt employees and failed to pay them overtime wages and to provide other benefits they alleged were due to non-exempt employees. Specifically, Plaintiffs allege violations of California’s wage and hour laws, including Labor Code §§ 510 and 1994 (overtime), §§ 512 and 226.7 (meals and rest breaks), § 226 (itemized wage statements), and Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq. (unfair business practices). The Class Period is from 10-27-2002 to 7-23-2008. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **William A. Kershaw**  **Lyle W. Cook**  **Stuart C. Talley**  **Kershaw Cutter &**  **Ratinoff LLP**  **401 Watt Avenue**  **Sacramento, CA 95864** |
| **1-26-2015** | **11-CV-02509** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: High-Tech Employee Antitrust Litigation**  Employee-plaintiffs allege that Defendants entered into a series of agreements with each other not to recruit each other’s employees, in violation of federal and state antitrust laws. The Class Periods are as follows: 1) Adobe, Apple, Google and Intel, from 3-2005 through 12-2009; 2) Intuit, from 6-2007 through 12-2009; 3) Lucasfilm and Pixar, from 1-2005 through 12-2009. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:**  **Kelly M. Dermody**  **Lieff Cabraser Heimann &**  **Bernstein, LLP**  **275 Battery Street**  **29th Floor**  **San Francisco, CA 94111**  **415 956-1000 (Ph.)**  [**kdermody@lchb.com**](mailto:kdermody@lchb.com) |
| **1-27-2015** | **11-CV-04585** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Richard Noll and Rhythm Motor Sports, LLC v. eBay, Inc.**  Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that, for certain time periods: 1) eBay did not properly explain that the Insertion Fees and Optional Feature Fees for Good Til Cancelled (GTC) Listings would be charged on a recurring basis every 30 days, and 2) eBay should not have charged sellers Insertion Fees and Optional Feature Fees for GTC Listings except at the times of the initial listings. The Class Period is from 3-30-2010 to 6-19-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Keith R. Verges**  **Figari & Davenport,**  **L.L.P.**  **901 Main Street**  **Suite 3400**  **Dallas, TX 75202-3796** |
| **1-30-2015** | **12-CV-01079** | **(N.D. Ala.)** | **Coates, et al. v. MidFirst Bank, et al.**  Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that MidFirst Bank, doing business as Midland Mortgage (“Midland”) arranged for improper kickbacks to its affiliate, Firstinsure, in the form of unearned “commissions” on Life Partner Holding Inc. (LPHI). Based on this conduct, Lead Plaintiff asserted claims against the MidFirst Defendants for breach of contract (against Midland); breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing (against Midland); and unjust enrichment (against Midland and Firstinsure). The Class Period is from 6-6-2008 through the Preliminary Approval Date. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Beasley, Allen, Crow,**  **Methvin, Portis & Miles,**  **P.C.**  **Archie I. Grubb, II**  **Andrew E. Brashier**  **218 Commerce Street**  **P.O. Box 4160 (36103)**  **Montgomery, AL 36104**  **334 269-2343 (Ph.)**  **334 954-7555 (Fax)** |
| **1-30-2015** | **10-CV-00804** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **Hawk Valley, Inc. v. Elaine G. Taylor, et al.**  Fax-recipient-plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, by faxing advertisements to the Class without their prior express invitations or permission to do so. The Defendants sent one or more faxes on or about 6-17-2006. | **8-6-2015** | **For more information write to:**  **Brian J. Wanca**  **Anderson + Wanca**  **3701 Algonquin Road**  **Suite 760**  **Rolling Meadows, IL 60008** |
| **1-30-2015** | **13-CV-01037** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Denis Mulligan, et al. v. Impax Laboratories, Inc., et al.**  Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege violations of Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b) and 78t(a) (the “Exchange Act”), and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. Lead Plaintiff alleges that Defendants either knowingly or recklessly made false and/or misleading statements to the public concerning Impax’s ability to correct deficiencies cited by the Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”). Lead Plaintiff alleges further that disclosure of the truth caused a drop in the share price of the Company’s common stock. The Class Period is from 6-6-2011 to 3-4-2013. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Daniel S. Sommers**  **Christopher Lometti**  **Joshua M. Kolsky**  **Genevieve O. Fontan**  **Cohen Milstein Sellers &**  **Toll PLLC**  **1100 New York Ave, N.W.**  **East Tower, Suite 500**  **Washington, D.C. 20005** |