

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
7-2-2014	07-CV-5634	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Precision Associates, Inc., et al. v. Panalpina World Transport (Holding) Ltd., et al. Plaintiffs allege, in a Consolidated Amended Complaint ("CAC"), that Defendants are various airlines that agreed to fix, raise, maintain, and/or stabilize fares for air passenger travel, including associated surcharges, for international flights between the U.S. and Asia/Oceania. The CAC alleges that beginning no later than 1-1-2000, Defendants and their co-conspirators agreed, and began, to impose air passengers air fare increases, including fuel surcharge increases, that were in substantial lockstep both in their timing and amount.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities that purchased passenger air transportation that included at least one flight segment between the U.S. and Asia or Oceania from Defendants or their co-conspirator, or any predecessor, subsidiary or affiliate thereof, at any time between 1-1-2000 and the Effective Date.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call fax or e-mail:</p> <p>Attorney for Defendant Vietnam Airlines Company Limited:</p> <p>Robert B. Hawk Hogan Lovells US LLP 4085 Campbell Avenue Suite 100 Menlo Park, CA 94025</p> <p>1 650 463-4000 (Ph.)</p> <p>1 650 463-4008 (Fax)</p> <p>Robert.hawk@hoganlovells.com</p>
7-3-2014	11-CV-00585	(D. Or.)	<p>In re: Vestas Wind Systems A/S Securities Litigation The Complaint asserts claims under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and contends that Vestas made false statements and omitted material facts about its compliance with revenue-recognition rules and the impact of those rules on the company's reported revenue and earnings. The principal claim is that Vestas did not properly account for changes in</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Henry Rosen Patrick Daniels Trig Smith Keith Park Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP 655 West Broadway Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>the interpretation of intentional accounting standards that allegedly prohibited Vestas from recognizing revenue and earnings from certain types of contracts until the projects had been completed and all risk had been transferred to the customers. The Complaint claims that Vestas knew of the new accounting interpretation (IFRIC 15) before and during the Class Period, but ignored it and misleadingly told investors until 2010 that IFRIC 15 was not expected to have a material impact on Vestas's financial reporting.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons, entities, or legal beneficiaries or participants in any entities who, during the period from 2-11-2009 through 2-9-2012, inclusive, purchased American Depositary Receipts ("ADRs") or Vestas common stock in U.S. domestic transactions (including on the over-the-counter market). A U.S. domestic transaction is one in which either the purchaser incurred irrevocable liability or title to the securities was transferred in the U.S. A purchase of an ADR in a U.S. domestic transaction is considered a U.S. domestic transaction.</p>		
7-3-2014	12-CV-01791	(S.D. Cal.)	<p>Kevin Lemieux v. EZ Lube, Inc., et al. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant is in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. §227, et seq., based on unsolicited telemarketing calls announcing the acquisition of certain quick lube service centers in Southern California.</p>	12-8-2014	<p>For more information write, call or e-mail:</p> <p>Joshua B. Swigart Hyde & Swigart 2221 Camino Del Rio South Suite 1010 San Diego, CA 92108</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Class Members are all persons within the U.S. who received any telephone call from Defendants or their agent(s) to said person's cellular telephone made through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system or with an artificial or prerecorded voice, which allegedly was not made for emergency purposes or with the recipient's prior express consent, between 7-19-2008 and the date of Preliminary Approval.</p>		josh@westcoastlitigation.com
7-3-2014	08-CV-00042	(E.D.N.Y.)	<p>Precision Associates, Inc., et al. v. Panalpina World Transport (Holding) Ltd., et al. Plaintiffs allege that the Settling Defendants participated in unlawful conspiracies to restrain trade pursuant to which Settling Defendants and the alleged co-conspirators agreed to fix, raise, or maintain the prices of specified Freight Forwarding Services for shipments within, to or from the U.S. or for purchases made within the U.S. during the Class Period, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who directly purchased U.S. Freight Forwarding Services: (a) for shipments within, to, or from the U.S., or (b) purchased or sold in the U.S. regardless of the location of shipment; from any of the Defendants or any subsidiary or affiliate thereof, at any time during the period from 1-1-2001 to 1-4-2011.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or fax:</p> <p>Benjamin M. Jaccarino Lovell Stewart Halebian Jacobson LLP 61 Broadway Suite 501 New York, NY 10006</p> <p>212 608-1900 (Ph.)</p> <p>212 719-4775 (Fax)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
7-3-2014	13-CV-00905	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Hector Sarinana, et al. v. DS Waters of America, Inc.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendant failed to pay all wages and overtime due, failed to provide legally-compliant meal breaks, failed to issue proper wage statements, failed to pay all wages due upon termination, and engaged in unfair competition. The Lawsuits seek relief for alleged overtime and wages due, and various other remedies and penalties under state and federal laws.</p> <p>The Court has granted preliminary approval to a settlement of the Lawsuits involving the following two groups of individuals who jointly comprise the "Settlement Class":</p> <p>Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") Collective Class Members are all persons employed by Defendant in any state other than California as Route Sales Representatives, Route Sales Specialists, Route Trainees, Industrial Route Representatives, or in any other sales position, who were eligible for overtime and incentives under Defendant's pay plans, who sold, delivered, and/or transported Defendant's products, and who were employed in such a position between 2-28-2010 and the date of preliminary approval of the Settlement.</p> <p>California Class Members are all persons employed by Defendant in California as Route Sales Representatives, Route Sales Specialists, Route Trainees, Industrial Route</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or e-mail:</p> <p>Edward J. Wynne Wynne Law Firm 100 Drakes Landing Road Suite 275 Greenbrae, CA 94904</p> <p>415 461-6400</p> <p>ewynne@wynnelawfirm.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			Representatives, or in any other sales position, who were eligible for overtime and incentives under Defendant's pay plans, who sold, delivered, and/or transported Defendant's products and were employed in such a position between 2-28-2009 and the date of preliminary approval of the Settlement.		
7-3-2014	14-CV-00029	(E.D. Pa.)	<p>Kevin Turner and Shawn Wooden, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated v. National Football League and NFL Properties LLC</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that retired players experienced head trauma during their NFL football playing careers that resulted in brain injuries, which have caused or may cause them long-term neurological problems. The Plaintiffs accuse the NFL Parties of being aware of the evidence and the risks associated with repetitive traumatic brain injuries but failing to warn and protect the players against the long-term risks, and ignoring and concealing this information from the players.</p> <p>The Settlement Class includes three types of Class Members:</p> <p>Retired NFL Football Players: all living NFL Football players who, prior to 7-7-2014, (1) have retired, formally or informally, from playing professional football with the NFL or any Member Club, including AFL, World League of American Football, NFL Europe League and NFL Europa League Players, or (2) were formerly on any roster, including preseason, regular season,</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information call or visit:</p> <p>1 855-887-3485 (Ph.)</p> <p>www.nflconcussionsettlement.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>or postseason, of any such Member Club or league and no longer are under contract to a Member Club and are not seeking active employment as a player with any Member Club, whether signed to a roster or signed to any practice squad, developmental squad, or taxi squad of a Member Club.</p> <p>Representative Claimants: Authorized representatives, ordered by a court or other official of competent jurisdiction under applicable state law, of deceased, legally incapacitated or incompetent Retired NFL Football Players.</p> <p>Derivative Claimants: Spouses, parents, dependent children, or any other persons who properly under applicable state law assert the right to sue independently or derivatively by reason of their relationship with a living or deceased Retired NFL Football Player. (For example, a spouse asserting the right to sue due to the injury of a husband who is a Retired NFL Football Player.)</p> <p>The Settlement recognizes two separate groups ("Subclasses") of Settlement Class Members based on the Retired NFL Football Player's injury status prior to 7-7-2014:</p> <p>Subclass 1 includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retired NFL Football Players who were <u>not</u> diagnosed with ALS, Parkinson's Disease, Alzheimer's Disease, Level 2 Neurocognitive Impairment (i.e., moderate Dementia), Level 1.5 		

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Neurocognitive Impairment (<i>i.e.</i>, early dementia) or Death with chronic traumatic encephalopathy ("CTE") prior to 7-7-2014, and their Representative Claimants and Derivative Claimants.</p> <p>Subclass 2 includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retired NFL Football Players who <u>were</u> diagnosed with Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis ("ALS"), Parkinson's Disease, Alzheimer's Disease, Level 2 Neurocognitive Impairment (<i>i.e.</i>, early Dementia) or Death with CTE prior to 7-7-2014, and their Representative Claimants and Derivative Claimants. • Representative claimants of deceased Retired NFL Football Players who were diagnosed with ALS, Parkinson's Disease, Alzheimer's Disease, Level 2 Neurocognitive Impairment (<i>i.e.</i>, early Dementia) prior to death or who died prior to 7-7-2014 and received a diagnosis of Death with CTE. 		
7-7-2014	13-CV-05118	(E.D.N.Y.)	<p>Susan Rice v. National Enterprise Systems, Inc. ("NES"), et al.</p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that NES violated a federal law known as the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") by sending consumers initial written collection communications, which made false, deceptive, and misleading representations by listing "CAVALRY PORTFOLIO SERVICES, LLC" as a Client and not providing the name of the creditor of the alleged debts it sought to collect. The lawsuit alleges that NES's</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, fax or e-mail:</p> <p>William F. Horn Law Office of William F. Horn 188-01B 71st Crescent Fresh Meadows, NY 11365</p> <p>866 596-9003 (Fax)</p> <p>Andrew T. Thomasson</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>foregoing misrepresentations violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA").</p> <p>Class Members are all natural persons in the State of New York to whom NES sent an initial written communication, to Plaintiff's complaint, which was not returned as undeliverable, and which lists "CAVALRY PORTFOLIO SERVICES, LLC" as a Client and does not provide the name of the creditor, during a period beginning on 9-13-2012, and ending on 10-14-2013.</p>		<p>Thomasson Law, LLC 101 Hudson Street 21st Floor Jersey City, NJ 07302</p> <p>855 479-9969 (Fax)</p> <p>Andrew@thomassonllc.com</p>
7-7-2014	14-CV-01983	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Connolly v. Weight Watchers North America, Inc.</p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that Weight Watchers North America, Inc. ("Weight Watchers") violated California's wage and hour laws. The case asserts claims nearly identical to those asserted by a similarly-situated class of individuals in Sabatino v. Weight Watchers North America, Inc., Case No. CV 09-4926 THE (N.D. Cal. 2009), represented by Rudy, Exelrod, Zieff & Lowe, LLP, who are also the attorneys in this follow-up action. The Sabatino case was resolved pursuant to court-approved settlement on 5-23-2011. That settlement covered wage and hour claims arising during the time period from 9-17-2005 to 1-8-2011. However, Weight Watchers' policies and practices challenged in the Sabatino case remained in place until 12-9-2012. Effective 12-9-2012, Weight Watchers changed the payroll practices that have been challenged in this lawsuit and in the preceding Sabatino case. Accordingly, the time period at issue in this lawsuit is from 1-9-2011 to 12-9-</p>	12-15-2014	<p>For more information write or e-mail:</p> <p>Steven G. Zieff John T. Mullan Michelle G. Lee Rudy, Exelrod, Zieff & Lowe, LLP 351 California Street Suite 700 San Francisco, CA 94104</p> <p>sgz@rezlaw.com jtm@rezlaw.com mjl@rezlaw.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>2012.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who worked for Weight Watchers North America, Inc. as Leaders and/or Receptionists, including those who performed "Location Coordinator" work (pay code 30 and 41) in California at any time during the period from 1-9-2011 to 12-9-2012, according to Weight Watchers' payroll records.</p>		
7-7-2013	12-CV-0304	(S.D. Cal.)	<p>Carr, et al. v. Tadin, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Defendant Tadin, Inc. made false and misleading claims, and breached express and implied warranties regarding its products.</p> <p>Class Members are all who purchased one of the Tadin, Inc. products listed below, between 12-21-2008 and 6-21-2014, in the U.S. for personal or household use</p> <p>Included Products: Zendo Dieters Tea, Zendo Extra Fuerte (Extra Strength) Dieters Tea, Zendo Dieters Tea Capsules, Slim-Mate Tea, Alcachofa (Artichoke) Extra Tea, Alcachofa (Artichoke) Capsules, Alcachofa (Artichoke) Extra Capsules, Aloe Vera with Cactus (Sabila Con Nopal) Tea, Aloe Vera with Cactus (Sabila Con Nopal) Capsules, Manzanilla Tea, Manzanilla con Anis Tea, Manzanilla con Menta Tea, Tila Tea, Siete Azahres Tea, Tea de Limon, Yerbabuena Tea, Bronco Tea, Linaza Extra, Alcachofa con Linaza, and Nopal Capsules.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, visitor call:</p> <p>Ronald A. Marron Law Office of Ronald A. Marron 651 Arroyo Drive San Diego, CA 92103</p> <p>ron@consumersadvocates.com</p> <p>619 696-9006 (Ph.)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
7-7-2014	07-CV-5634	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>In re: Transpacific Passenger Air Transportation Antitrust Litigation</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that this action arises from a global conspiracy among certain airlines to fix, raise, maintain, and/or stabilize prices for long haul passenger transpacific flights to and from the U.S. ("Passenger Air Transportation"), and for fixed fuel surcharges on this transportation ("Fuel Surcharges"). Fuel surcharges are fees charged to passengers by airlines purportedly to compensate the airlines for increased fuel costs.</p> <p>Class Members are all individuals or entities who purchased passenger air transportation, for long haul transpacific flights and who paid a fuel surcharge on their tickets from any of the Defendants and their co-conspirators or any predecessor, subsidiary, or affiliate of each, at any time during the period from 2004 to 8-2007.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or fax:</p> <p>Christopher L. Lebsack Hausfeld LLP 44 Montgomery Street San Francisco, CA 94111</p> <p>415 633-1908 (Ph.) 415 358-4980 (Fax)</p>
7-7-2014	13-CV-05782	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>Affiliated Health Care Associates, P.C. v. Handit2 Network, LLC, et al.</p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that Handit2 Network, LLC ("Handit2"), Standard Homeopathic Company ("SHC"), and Hyland's, Inc. ("Hyland's") sent an unsolicited facsimile advertisement, and that the sending of the fax and others like it violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act, the Illinois Consumer Fraud Act and the Illinois common law of conversion.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:</p> <p>Edelman, Combs, Lattuner & Goodwin, LLC 120 S. LaSalle Street Suite 1800 Chicago, IL 60603</p> <p>312 739-4200 (Ph.) 312 419-0379 (Fax)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			Class Members are all persons and entities with fax numbers that, during the Class Period (8-14-2008 through and including 5-1-2014), were sent facsimiles by SHC and/or Hyland's and/or Handit2 promoting products offered by SHC and/or Hyland's or promoting participation in sampling programs for products offered by SHC and/or Hyland's.		www.edcombs.com
7-8-2014	12-CV-00195	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Lighthouse for the Blind and Visually Impaired, et al. v. Redbox Automated Retail, LLC, et al.</p> <p>The lawsuit alleges that Redbox Automated Retail, LLC violated federal and California law by offering video and game rental services at self-service, touchscreen kiosks in California that legally blind persons cannot independently access.</p> <p>Class Members are all legally blind individuals who have attempted to access the DVD, Blu-Ray and/or video game rental services available at Redbox Kiosks in California since 1-12-2010 or who have been deterred from doing so due to the lack of features for blind users at Redbox Kiosks since 1-12-2010.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Michael Nunez Disability Rights Advocates 2001 Center Street Fourth Floor Berkeley, CA 94704</p>
7-8-2014	08-CV-03178	(D.N.J.)	<p>Tubbs, et al. v. North American Title Agency, Inc., et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that North American and, as it was formerly known Independence, are title agencies that conduct real estate closings. When a property owner using North American or Independence as the closing agent paid off in</p>	10-16-2014	<p>For more information write, call or e-mail:</p> <p>Robert J. LaRocca Kohn, Swift & Graf, P.C. One South Broad Street Suite 2100</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>full an existing mortgage or home equity loan, they were charged a "Satisfaction Fee" for work done to close out each loan for properties located in New Jersey. North American and Independence charged \$50 per Satisfaction Fee from 1-1-2003 to 1-1-2004, and \$75 per Satisfaction Fee afterwards.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities who, from 1-1-2003 through the date of the Preliminary Approval Order, were charged by and paid to any North American Defendant a Satisfaction Fee for a property located in New Jersey. The Settlement Class does not include any person or entity for which the relevant North American Defendant actually paid the county clerk to record a document evidencing the satisfaction of the relevant prior mortgage or other line secured by the property.</p>		<p>Philadelphia, PA 19107 215 238-1968 (Fax) rlarroca@kohnswift.com</p>
7-10-2014	07-CV-2067	(E.D.N.Y.)	<p>U.S. and The Vulcan Society, Inc., Jamel Nicholson, and Rusebell Wilson - classwide injunctive relief; Roger Gregg, Marcus Haywood, and Kevin Walker - on behalf of a subclass of all other non-hire victims similarly situated; and Candido Nuñez and Kevin Simpkins - delayed-hire victims v. City of New York, et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs-Intervenors allege that the Defendants have used screening and selection criteria in appointing entry-level firefighters which have an adverse impact upon black applicants, which are not job related for the position in question and do not otherwise meet</p>	10-1-2014 10-2-2014	<p>For more information visit or call: questions@FDNYlitigation.com 866 297-7120 (Ph.)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>the requirements of Title VII, and which violate the above-mentioned federal, state and local anti-discrimination laws. These criteria have included written examinations used to screen out applicants, as well as to rank them for hiring purposes, which have not been validated and are not job related, and which create unwarranted and discriminatory obstacles to the hiring of black firefighters.</p> <p>Class Members include all Black and/or Hispanic Applicants for the position of entry level firefighter for the New York Fire Department and who took written exam #7029 or 2043.</p>		
7-10-2014	09-CV-1967 09-CV-04128	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Keller, et al v. Electronic Arts Inc. National Collegiate Athletic Association & Collegiate Licensing Company Bishop v. Electronic Arts, Inc., et al. (See 6-6-2014 CAFA Notice for In re: NCAA Student-Athlete Name & Likeness Licensing for more information). This Notice concerns two of the settlements covered by the 6-6-2014 Notice.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write or call:</p> <p>The EA Settlement Class Counsel:</p> <p>Steven W. Berman Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP 1918 Eight Avenue Suite 3300 Seattle, WA 98101</p> <p>206 623-7292 (Ph.)</p> <p>The NCAA Settlement Class Counsel:</p> <p>Stuart Paynter 1200 G Street NW Suite 800 Washington, DC 20005</p> <p>202 626-4486 (Ph.)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
7-10-2014	11-CV-05504	(D.N.J.)	<p>Chaudhri, et al. v. OSRAM Sylvania, Inc., et al. Plaintiffs alleges that Sylvania misrepresented that certain replacement automotive lights are brighter, provide a wider beam and allow drivers to see farther down the road than standard halogen lights.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities that bought one or more of the Covered Products, other than for resale or distribution, in the U.S. (or any territory or possession) from 9-22-2005 to (preliminary approval date].</p> <p>Covered Products are: SilverStar ULTRA®, SilverStar®, XtraVision®, or Cool Blue® replacement headlight capsules; SilverStar®, XtraVision®, or Cool Blue® sealed beam headlights; and SilverStar® fog or auxiliary lights.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>John E. Keefe, Jr. Keefe Bartles 170 Monmouth Street Red Bank, NJ 07701</p> <p>Barry R. Eichen Eichen Crutchlow Zaslow & McElroy, LLP 40 Ethel Road Edison, NJ 08817</p>
7-11-2014	13-CV-10636	(D. Mass)	<p>Bilewicz, et al. v. Fidelity Management and Research LLC (FMR LLC) Plaintiffs allege that Defendants acted in their own self-interest instead of the interest of Plan participants by including in the Plan's investment options a disproportionate number of FRM LLC ("FMR") mutual funds. As a result, the Plaintiffs claim, Plan participants paid higher fees and obtained less return on their investment while Defendants benefited from fees on these funds that were collected by Defendants or their subsidiaries. In the other case, <i>Yeaw, et al. v. FMR LLC, et al.</i>, Civil Action No. 14-</p>	10-14-2014	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Gregory Y. Porter Bailey & Glasser LLP 910 17th Street, NW Suite 800 Washington, DC 20006</p> <p>Todd Schneider Schneider Wallace Cottrell Konecky LLP 180 Montgomery Street Suite 2000 San Francisco, CA 94104</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>10035-DJC, Plaintiffs claim that Defendants breached their fiduciary duties by failing to obtain favorable revenue-sharing rebate arrangements.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who participated in the <i>Plan</i> (defined as the FMR LLC Profit Sharing Plan, and all predecessor plans or successor plans, individually and collectively, and any trust created under such Plan) during the <i>Settlement Class Period</i> (defined as 3-20-2007 through [either (i) the date of the Settlement Agreement or, (ii) in the event that the Court does not enter the preliminary approval order before 7-28-2014, then 7-28-2-14]), except for <i>Committee Members</i> (defined as members of the FMR LLC Investment Committee from 3-20-2007 through 3-19-2013, and the FMR LLC Retirement Committee from 1-8-2008 through 1-7-2014).</p>		
7-11-2014	07-CV-5634	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>In re: Transpacific Passenger Air Transportation Antitrust Litigation (See 7-7-2014 CAFA Notice for this case)</p> <p>Plaintiffs filed suit against Japan Airlines Company, Ltd. ("JAL"), Malaysian Air, and a number of other airline defendants alleging price-fixing with respect to certain air passenger surcharges and fares. In settlement agreements dated 6-18-2014 and 6-13-2013, respectively (the "Settlement Agreements"), JAL and Malaysian Air each entered into separate proposed class action settlements with Plaintiffs. Three other Defendants have reached</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or fax:</p> <p>Attorney for Defendant Japan Airlines Company, Ltd.</p> <p>Steptoe & Johnson LLP 1330 Connecticut Ave. NW Washington, DC 20036</p> <p>202 429-6264 (Ph.)</p> <p>202 429-3902 (Fax)</p> <p>Attorney for Defendant</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>proposed class action settlements as well, and all five settlements are the subject of a motion for preliminary approval currently pending before the District Court.</p> <p>Settlement Class Definition: The Settlement Agreements define the settlement classes as follows:</p> <p>JAL Settlement Class: All persons and entities that purchased passenger air transportation that included at least one flight segment between the U.S and Asia or Oceania from Defendants, or any predecessor, subsidiary, or affiliate thereof, at any time between 1-1-2000 and the Effective Date.</p> <p>Malaysian Air Settlement Class: All persons and entities that purchased passenger air transportation that included at least one flight segment between the U.S. and Asia/Oceania from Defendants or their co-conspirators, or any predecessor, subsidiary or affiliate thereof, at any time between 1-1-2000 and the Effective Date.</p> <p>Thai Airways Settlement Class: All persons and entities that purchased passenger air transportation that included at least one flight segment between the U.S. and Asia or Oceania from Defendants, or any predecessor, subsidiary or affiliate thereof, at any time between 1-1-2000 and the Effective Date.</p> <p>Air France/VN Settlement Class: All persons and</p>		<p>Malaysian Airline System Berhad</p> <p>Shahzeb Lari Paul Hastings LLP 75 East 55th Street New York, NY 10022</p> <p>212 318-6098 (Ph.)</p> <p>212 230-7759 (Fax)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>entities that purchased passenger air transportation that included at least one flight segment between the U.S. and Asia or Oceania from Defendants or their co-conspirators, or any predecessor, subsidiary or affiliate thereof, at any time between 1-1-2000 and the Effective Date.</p>		
7-11-2014	08-CV-01463	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>Wallace, et al. v Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., et al. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants failed to pay proper overtime to Branch Account Executives from 1-1-2002 to 12-31-2004, during the period in which such employees were classified as exempt.</p> <p>Class Members are all individuals who received compensation from Full Spectrum Lending, Inc. in the position of Branch Account Executive between 1-1-2002 and 12-31-2004 who were sent Acknowledgement Letters in connection with Full Spectrum's back pay program, excluding those Branch Account Executives who released their claims through settlement in the case of Walker v. Countrywide Credit Industries, Inc., et al., U.S. District Court, Northern District of Texas Case No. 3:03-CV-00684-N.</p>	1-30-2015	<p>For more information write, call or fax:</p> <p>Dale M. Fiola Attorney at Law 200 North Harbor Blvd. Suite 217 Anaheim, CA 92805</p> <p>714 635-7888 (Ph.) 714 635-3323 (Fax)</p>
7-14-2014	07-CV-1894	(D. Conn.)	<p>In re: U.S. Foodservice, Inc. Pricing Litigation ("USF") Plaintiffs allege that Redgate conspired with USF, between 1998 and 2005, to improperly inflate the "cost" of goods USF sold to its</p>	12-9-2014	<p>For more information write or call:</p> <p>Richard L. Wyatt, Jr. Todd M. Stenerson Torsten M. Kracht</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>customers with cost-plus purchasing arrangements, and thereby violated the federal Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organizations ("RICO") laws.</p> <p>Any company or individual in the U.S. who purchased products from USF pursuant to an arrangement that defined a sale price in terms of a cost component plus a markup ("cost-plus arrangement"), and for which USF used a Vienna Ab Initio Simulation Package ("VASP") transaction to calculate the cost component is a Class Member. Those who purchased products from USF pursuant to a cost-plus arrangement at any time during the period of 1998 through 2005, when the alleged VASP System was in place, may be Class Members. The alleged VASPs were (i) Seafood Marketing Specialists, Inc., (ii) Frozen Farms, Inc., (iii) Produce Solutions, Inc., a/k/a Cross Valley Produce, Inc. (iv) Private Labels Distribution, Inc., a/k/a Private Brands Distribution, Inc., (v) Specialty Supply & Marketing, Inc., and (vi) Commodity Management Systems, Inc.</p>		<p>Ryan P. Phair Hunton & Williams LLP 2200 Pennsylvania Ave, NW Washington, DC 20037</p> <p>202 955-1500 (Ph.)</p>
7-16-2014	12-CV-01475	(D.N.J.)	<p>Trewin, et al. v. Church & Dwight Co., Inc. Plaintiffs allege that the labeling, advertising and marketing of the Essentials™ deodorant with Old Label was misleading to consumers because not all of the ingredients are natural.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities who purchased Arm & Hammer® Essentials™ deodorant with the Old Label in the U.S. Excluded from</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>James C. Shah Shepherd, Finkelman, Miller & Shah, LLP 475 White Horse Pike Collingswood, NJ 08107</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			Class are: (i) those who purchased for resale; (ii) those with claims for personal injuries arising from the use of the Essentials™ deodorant with the Old Label; (iii) defendant and its officers, directors and employees; (iv) any person who files a valid and timely Request for Exclusion; and (v) the Judges to whom this Litigation are assigned and any members of their immediate families.		
7-16-2014	10-CV-01114	(D. Del.)	<p>In re: Wilmington Trust Corp.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants allowed the investment of Wilmington Trust Plan accounts in the Wilmington Trust Stock Fund throughout the Class Period despite the fact that they knew or should have known that such investment was imprudent because, as alleged in their Complaint and among other things: (a) the Company had too much loan exposure to properties in Southern Delaware poultry country; (b) the Company violated prudent lending standards in connection with real estate lending practices, and utilized outdated appraisals; (c) the Company did not accept that its mid-Atlantic zone was being adversely affected by the market conditions affecting its peers; (d) the Company underreported its reserves for real-estate loan losses, which artificially inflated its net income and reduced its losses; (e) the Company engaged in unsafe or unsound practices and/or violations of law or regulation as determined by federal banking regulators; and (f) the Company's problems caused it to be on the verge of collapse. Named Plaintiffs allege that as a</p>	11-24-2014	<p>For more information write call or e-mail:</p> <p>Michael J. Klein Stull, Stull & Brody 6 East 45th Street New York, NY 10017 212 687-7230 (Ph.) mklein@ssbny.com</p> <p>Michael J. Prame Sarah A. Zumwalt Groom Law Group, Chartered 1701 Pennsylvania Ave, NW Washington, DC 20006-5811 202 857-0620 mprame@groom.com szumwalt@groom.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>result, the Wilmington Trust Plan and the participants incurred significant losses due to the substantial investments in the Wilmington Trust Stock Fund.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons, other than Defendants, who were Participants in or Beneficiaries of the Wilmington Trust Thrift Savings Plan at any time during the period from 12-31-2006 through and including 5-13-2011 and whose Wilmington Trust Thrift Savings Plan accounts were invested in the Wilmington Trust Corporation Stock Fund at any time during the period from 12-31-2006 through and including 5-13-2011.</p>		
7-16-2014	08-MD-2002	(E.D. Pa.)	<p>In re: Processed Egg Products Antitrust Litigation</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants certain Producers of Shell Eggs and Egg Products conspired to decrease the supply of eggs. Plaintiffs allege that this supply conspiracy limited, fixed, raised, stabilized, or maintained the price of the 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.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Steven A. Asher Weinstein Kitchenoff & Asher LLC 1845 Walnut Street Suite 1100 Philadelphia, PA 19103</p> <p>Michael D. Hausfeld Hausfeld LLP 1700 K Street NW Suite 650 Washington, DC 20006</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Class Members are all persons and entities that purchased Shell Eggs and Egg Products in the U.S. directly from any Producer, including any Defendant, during the Class Period from 1-1-2000 through date of preliminary approval.</p>		
7-17-2014	13-CV-01025	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Bartelt v. Affymax, Inc. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants issued materially false and misleading statements regarding the Company's business practices and financial results. Specifically, defendant failed to disclose that 2% of patients who were administered Omontys experienced hypersensitivity reactions resulting in anaphylaxis, a serious and life-threatening allergic reaction, a third of whom needed medical intervention - and that 0.02% of those administered the drug experienced fatal anaphylaxis reactions. As a result of these false statements, Affymax stock traded at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period, reaching a height of \$27.74 per share in intraday trading on 10-17-2012.</p> <p>Class Members are all who purchased or otherwise acquired Affymax common stock between 8-8-2011 and 2-22-2013, inclusive.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Leigh Handelman Smollar Pomerantz LLP Ten South La Salle Street Suite 3505 Chicago, Illinois 60603</p>
7-18-2014	12-CV-00340	(D.N.J.)	<p>MTB Investment Partners, LP v. Siemens Hearing Instruments, Inc. ("SHI") Plaintiffs allege that SHI acted with scienter in that it knowingly or with extreme or</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis LLP</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>deliberate recklessness engaged in acts, practices, and a scheme and course of business that artificially suppressed HearUSA's common stock price beginning on or around 1-18-2011 and continuing during the Class Period. Specifically, SHI knew that the aforementioned statements in SHI's 1-18-2011 Schedule 13D and Amended Schedule 13D were each materially false and misleading; knew that the statements in these filings would be issued or disseminated to the investing public; and knowingly and substantially participated or acquiesced in the issuance of such statements anyway.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities, their agents, successors in interest assigns, heirs, executors and administrators who sold or otherwise disposed of HearUSA common stock between 1-18-2011 and 7-31-2011, through which the Class Members, either directly or indirectly, were damaged thereby.</p>		<p>Lisa J. Rodriguez Woodland Falls Corporate Park 220 Lake Drive East Suite 200 Cherry Hill, NJ 08002</p>
7-18-2014	12-MD-02343	(E.D. Tenn.)	<p>In re : Skelaxin (Metaxalone) Antitrust Litigation</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that King (the manufacturer of Skelaxin) and Mutual tried and successfully delayed the availability of a less expensive generic version of the drug by enforcing invalid patents, making baseless requests to the Food and Drug Administration (called a Citizen Petition) and entering into an unlawful agreement. The Plaintiffs claim that these actions denied uninsured consumers, certain insured consumers, and third party payors</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>James G. Stranch, III Branstetter, Stranch & Jennings, PLLC 227 2nd Ave. North Suite 400 Nashville, TN 37201</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>(“TPPs”) like insurers who paid for Skelaxin or Metaxalone the benefits of competition and caused them to pay higher prices for Skelaxin and Metaxalone in certain states that they otherwise would have.</p> <p>Class Members are both TPPs and consumers. TPPs are included in the Settlement Class as a “Settlement Class Member” if they are an entity in the U.S. or its territories that paid or reimbursed some or all of the purchase price of Skelaxin or its AB-rated generic equivalents (Metaxalone) at a retail or mail order pharmacy located in Arizona, Arkansas, California, the District of Columbia, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Main, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, or Wisconsin (the “Class States”), in any form, for their members, employees, insureds, participants, or beneficiaries, other than for resale, between 11-4-2005 and date of preliminary approval (the “Class Period”). Government funded employee benefit plans are included in the Settlement Class.</p>		
7-18-2014	08-CV-5214	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>Standard Iron Works, et al. v. ArcelorMittal, et al. Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants (Nucor, U.S. Steel, Gerdau, AK Steel, Steel Dynamics, SSAB and CMC) conspired, in violation of the</p>	10-17-2014	<p>For more information write to: Fine, Kaplan and Black, R.P.C. Attn: Jeffrey S. Istvan</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>U.S. antitrust laws, to restrict their output and therefore raise or "fix" the prices for Steel Products sold for delivery in the U.S. between 4-1-2005 and 12-31-2007.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased Steel Products directly from any of the Defendants or their subsidiaries or controlled affiliates at any time between 4-1-2005 and 12-31-2007 for delivery in the U.S.</p>		<p>One South Broad Street 23rd Floor Philadelphia, PA 19107</p>
7-18-2014	09-CV-00125	(M.D. Tenn.)	<p>Abadeer, et al. v. Tyson Foods, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants failed to pay employees overtime pay for hours worked over 40 in a workweek, in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), and for hours worked under 40 hours in a workweek in breach of their employment contracts under Tennessee state law. There are approximately 6,857 class members covered by the Rule 23 breach of contract claim ("Rule 23 class claim"), 1,508 of these Rule 23 class members also timely opted into the FLSA portion of the lawsuit.</p> <p>Class Members include any individual who was employed as an hourly worker at Tyson's Goodlettsville, Tennessee Plant since 4-30-2003 who was hired on or before 2-25-2014 and was paid pursuant to Tyson's Alternative Time and Attendance System ("Covered Positions") and to any individual who timely opted into the FLSA portion of this lawsuit. Current and former Tyson employees in Covered Positions sued Tyson Foods, Inc. and Tyson Fresh Meats, Inc. ("Tyson"</p>	10-17-2014	<p>For more information contact by phone: The Heffler Group 1 844 245-3773 (Ph.)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>or "Defendants") to recover unpaid wages, including overtime pay, for Tyson's alleged failure to properly compensate its employees for work performed prior to the beginning of their scheduled Pay Start Time; work performed at the beginning and end of the 30 minute unpaid meal period; and prior to 1-2009, work performed after they clocked out at the end of their shifts.</p>		
7-18-2014	12-CV-02624	(E.D. Pa.)	<p>Giddiens v. First Advantage LNS Screening Solutions, Inc. f/k/a LexisNexis Screening Solutions, Inc.</p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that Defendant sold consumer background reports to businesses to help them make employment decisions. The suit alleges that Defendant violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681, <i>et seq.</i>, by including in the consumer report (background check) that was sold at least one record of criminal history that had been expunged prior to the date of the employment background screening report, as a result of data from the LifeCycle File developed by the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Court in connection with the preparation of that employment background screening report. Additional information about the FCRA can be found at the website of the Federal Trade Commission. www.ftc.gov.</p> <p>Class Members are defined below:</p> <p>All individuals who were the subject of an employment background screening report that was</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>James A. Francis Francis & Mailman, P.C. Land Title Building 19th Floor 100 South Broad Street Philadelphia, PA 19110</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>furnished by Defendant for an employment purpose within two years preceding the filing of this Action or during its pendency;</p> <p>That contained at least one record of criminal history that had been expunged prior to the date of the employment background screening report and</p> <p>As a result of data from the LifeCycle File developed by the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts not being taken into account in connection with the preparation of the employment background screening report so provided.</p>		
7-21-2014	12-CV-03824	(E.D. Pa.)	<p>Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al. v. Warner Chilcott Public Limited Company, et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated federal and state antitrust, unfair competition and/or consumer protection laws by engaging in an unlawful scheme to delay or block the market entry of less expensive, generic versions of Doryx®. Plaintiffs allege that this unlawful scheme involved, among other things: (i) switching Doryx® from capsules to tablets (and removing the capsules from the market), (ii) switching Doryx® from tablets of a lower strength to tablets of a higher strength, and (iii) switching Doryx® from unscored tablets to scored tablets. Plaintiffs claim that, by making these allegedly nuanced and insignificant changes to the Doryx® product, Defendants were able to charge supracompetitive prices long</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write or call:</p> <p>Water W. Noss Scott+Scott Attorneys At Law, LLP 707 Broadway Suite 1000 San Diego, CA 92101 619 233-4565 (Ph.)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>after generic versions of the drug product could have and should have entered the market. Plaintiffs allege that they, and the Class, were damaged by paying significantly higher prices for Doryx® as a result of Defendants' conduct.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities in the U.S. who reimbursed for, or indirectly purchased, other than for resale, branded Doryx® at any time during the period 9-21-2008 to 5-30-2014. For purposes of this definition, a person or entity "indirectly purchased" if they purchased Doryx® from an entity other than one of the Defendants, including for example, from a pharmacy or a mail order pharmacy.</p>		
7-21-2014	13-CV-6897	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>Northern Suburban Chiropractic Clinic, Ltd. v. RX Security Inc.</p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that RX Security violated certain consumer protection statutes by sending mass junk faxes or fax blasts to unwilling recipients in an effort to market its products.</p> <p>Class Members include all individuals or entities in the U.S. who were sent one or more facsimile advertisements from or on behalf of RX Security, or who own the facsimile machines to which the facsimiles were sent, through the date of preliminary approval.</p>	12-17-2014	<p>For more information write, call or fax:</p> <p>Joseph J. Siprut Siprut PC 17 North State Street Suite 1600 Chicago, IL 60602</p> <p>312 236-0000 (Ph.)</p> <p>312 948-9196 (Fax)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
7-23-2014	11-CV-11	(D.N.J.)	<p>Bais Yaakov of Spring Valley v. Peterson's Nelnet, LLC Plaintiff alleges that from 1-3-2007 through 1-3-2011, Peterson's Nelnet, LLC sent or caused to be sent facsimile advertisements to persons in the U.S. that violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA") and certain FCC regulations.</p> <p>Class Members are all who received a facsimile advertisement from Peterson's Nelnet, LLC between 1-3-2007 and 1-3-2011.</p>	10-30-2014	<p>For more information visit or call: www.petersonsclassaction.net 1 800 414-4370 (Ph.)</p>
7-24-2014	12-CV-10064	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>In re: Capital One Telephone Consumer Protection Act Litigation ("TCPA") The Court ordered the parties on 6-17-2014, to amend and re-file their preliminary approval papers in advance of a 7-29-2014 preliminary approval hearing. The parties did so on 7-14-2014 and this is the notice required by CAFA for that amended proposal for preliminary settlement approval. (See 6-23-2014 CAFA Notice for this case).</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Beth Terrell Terrell Marshall Daudt & Willie, PLLC 936 North 34th Street Suite 300 Seattle, Washington 98103</p> <p>Daniel M. Hutchinson Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP 275 Battery Street 29th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111</p>
7-25-2014	11-CV-04611	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>Robert O'Toole, et al. v. Sears Roebuck & Co., Kmart Corp, and Sears Holdings Management Corp. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the overtime wage provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the wage-and-hour laws of</p>	10-30-2014	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Michael A. Josephson Fibich, Leebron, Copeland, Briggs &</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>California, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Washington by misclassifying their salaried Loss Prevention Managers ("LPM") as exempt and not paying them overtime.</p> <p>Class Members are all who worked as a salaried exempt LPM for Sears, Roebuck and Co. full lines stores and/or Kmart stores in California, Illinois, Pennsylvania or Washington from 4-2-2009; New Jersey from 4-2-2010; and New York from 4-2-2006; through [preliminary approval date].</p>		<p>Josephson, L.L.P. 1150 Bissonnet Street Houston, TX 77005</p> <p>Douglas M. Werman Werman Salsa, P.C. 77 W. Washington Street Suite 1402 Chicago, IL 60602</p>
7-25-2014	12-CV-902	(E.D. Va.)	<p>Gilbert James, Susan Chandler, Theresa Hood, Adedayo Peterson and Joyce Ridgley v. Experian Information Solutions, Inc.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Experian Information Solutions, Inc. ("Experian") willfully violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681i.</p> <p>Class Members are all natural persons residing in the U.S. (a) for whom Experian received a dispute between 12-26-2010 and the present and (b) to whom Experian responded with a letter containing Paragraph 66 (see Settlement Agreement Exhibit 4 page 6).</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Matthew J. Erasquin Consumer Litigation Associates, P.C. 1800 Diagonal Road Suite 600 Alexandria, VA 22314</p>
7-29-2014	06-CV-6149	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>Driver, et al. v. W. Curtis Smith, et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that AppleIllinois required servers, bartenders, hosts and car-sides to perform non-tipped duties, but failed to pay</p>	10-30-2014	<p>For more information visit:</p> <p>http://appleillinois</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>them minimum wage, violating federal and state law. The Court found that AppleIllinois did violate the law. The Mello lawsuits claimed that AppleIllinois and Defendants Smith and Cortner failed to pay hourly employees who separate from employment all earned vacation pay.</p> <p>Class Members includes two groups of AppleIllinois employees: (i) tipped employees who worked at any time since 10-6-2003; and (ii) all hourly employees (including tipped employees) who worked since 8-17-2002 and who separated from employment.</p>		classaction.com/
7-31-2014	12-CV-03783	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Lusby v. GameStop, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that GameStop required class members to work off-the-clock, failed to provide meal and rest breaks, failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements, failed to pay wages timely upon Class members' terminations, and failed to reimburse for business expenses. Plaintiffs allege that these violations resulted in underpayment of wages and unreimbursed expenses to Class Members. Plaintiffs also seek civil penalties related to these claims. Plaintiffs seek to maintain a class action for their claims on behalf of themselves and all overtime-eligible employees of GameStop, in one or more of GameStop's California retail stores, between 6-21-2010 and 6-30-2012. This includes the job positions of Store Manager, Store Manager in Training, Area Manager, Assistant Store Manager, Senior Game Advisor, Lead Game</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Scott Edward Cole Molly A. DeSario Scott Cole & Associates, APC 1970 Broadway Ninth Floor Oakland, CA 94612</p> <p>510 891-9800 (Ph.) 510 891-7030 (Fax)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Advisor, and Game Advisor.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who are and/or were employed as overtime-eligible employees by GameStop, in one or more of GameStop's California retail stores, between 6-21-2010 and 6-30-2012.</p>		