| **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **7-3-2017** | **12-CV-00402** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Heater Control Panels Cases (Dealership Action)**  **Re Defendants: Alps Electric Co., Ltd., Alps Electric (North America), Inc., and Alps Automotive Inc.**  Plaintiffs bring this lawsuit against the Defendants, manufacturers, suppliers of Heater Control Panels globally and in the United States for engaging in a lengthy conspiracy to suppress and eliminate competition in the automotive parts industry by agreeing to rig bids for, and to fix, stabilize, and maintain the prices of these products, which were sold to automobile manufactures in the United States and elsewhere. The Defendants’ conspiracy successfully targeted the United States automotive industry, raising prices for car manufactures, car and truck dealers, and consumers. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Barrett Law Group, P.A.**  **P.O. Box 927**  **4040 Court Square**  **Lexington, MS 39095**  **Cuneo Gilbert & LaDuca, LLP**  **4725 Wisconsin Avenue, NW**  **Suite 200**  **Washington, DC 20016**  **Larson · King, LLP**  **2800 Wells Fargo Place**  **30 East Seventh Street**  **St. Paul, MN 55101** |
| **7-6-2017** | **16-CV-03742** | **(D. Md.)** | **Jack Boothe v. NorthStar Realty Finance Corp.,**  **et al.**  **Re Defendants: Northstar Realty Finance Corp., David T. Hamamoto, Judith A. Hannaway, Wesley D. Minami, Louis J. Paglia, Gregory Rush, and Charles W. Schoenherr**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated Section 14(a) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 14a-9 promulgated thereunder by soliciting stockholder votes with the Proxy Statements that the Colony Plaintiff alleged were false and/or misleading, and that the Individual Colony Capital Defendants were liable under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act, and sought, an order enjoining the Colony NorthStar Transaction unless or until the alleged material deficiencies in the Proxy Statements were corrected. | **Not set yet**  Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Charles J. Piven**  **Yelena Trepetin**  **Brower Piven, P.C.**  **1925 Old Valley Road**  **Stevenson, Md. 21153**  **410 332-0030 (Ph.)**  **410 685-1300 (Fax)**  [**piven@browerpiven.com**](mailto:piven@browerpiven.com)  [**trepetin@browerpiven.com**](mailto:trepetin@browerpiven.com) |
| **7-6-2017** | **16-CV-08376** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Balon v. Agria Corporation, et al.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the federal securities laws because of allegedly false and misleading statements to the investing public. Specifically, the Amended Complaint alleges that Agria failed to disclose that its share repurchase program, announced in June 2016, improperly sought to inflate the price of Agria American Depositary Shares. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Agria Corporation Litigation**  **c/o Strategic Claims**  **Services**  **600 N. Jackson St., Suite 3**  **Media, PA 19063**  **866 274-4004 (Ph.)**  **610 565-7985 (Fax)**  [**info@strategicclaims.net**](mailto:info@strategicclaims.net) |
| **7-7-2017** | **15-CV-02198** | **(D. Kan.)** | **Lengel v. HomeAdvisor, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that HomeAdvisor violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act by procuring background checks on job applicants without providing a “stand alone” disclosure informing them that a background check would be procured for employment purposes. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Nichols Kaster, PLLP**  **Attn: Kai Richter**  **4600 South 8th Street**  **Minneapolis, MN 55402** |
| **7-7-2017** | **16-CV-01079** | **(D. Md.)** | **Hodges v. Bon Secours Health System, Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that Bon Secours denied the Plans’ participants and beneficiaries the protections of ERISA by claiming that the Plans qualified as ERISA exempt “Church Plans.” The complaint also alleged that the Plans sponsored by Bon Secours—a non-profit Catholic healthcare provider—did not qualify as ERISA-exempt Church Plans. Plaintiffs filed a Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint on 10-6-2016. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Jamie Bowers**  **COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS**  **& TOLL PLLC**  **1100 New York Avenue, N.W.**  **Suite 500**  **Washington, D.C. 20005**  **202 408-4699 (Ph.)** |
| **7-7-2017** | **16-CV-03282** | **(D. Md.)** | **Carter v. Colony Capital, Inc., et al.**  **Re Defendants: Colony Capital, Thomas J. Barrack, Jr., Richard B. Saltzman, Nancy A. Curtin, George G.C. Parker, John A. Somers, and John L. Steffens**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated Section 14(a) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 14a-9 promulgated thereunder by soliciting stockholder votes with the Proxy Statements that the Colony Plaintiff alleged were false and/or misleading, and that the Individual Colony Capital Defendants were liable under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act, and sought among other things, an order enjoining the Colony NorthStar Transaction unless or until the alleged material deficiencies in the Proxy Statements were corrected. Also see CAFA Notice dated 7-6-2017 above. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Charles J. Piven**  **Yelena Trepetin**  **BROWER PIVEN, P.C.**  **1925 Old Valley Road Stevenson, Maryland 21153**  **410 332-0030 (Ph.)**  **410 685-1300 (Fax)**  [**piven@browerpiven.com**](mailto:piven@browerpiven.com)  [**trepetin@browerpiven.com**](mailto:trepetin@browerpiven.com) |
| **7-7-2017** | **06-CV-04359** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Bouder, et al. v. Prudential Financial, Inc., et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that Prudential improperly denied Covered Agents overtime pay in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201, et seq. (“FLSA”) and applicable state law. In addition, the Settled Lawsuits allege that  Prudential took unlawful deductions from the wages of Covered Agents, including recapture of certain commissions, and/or required some Covered Agents to bear certain necessary business-related expenses. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **LOVELL STEWART HALEBIAN LLP**  **John Halebian**  **Adam C. Mayes**  **Midtown Office**  **317 Madison Avenue**  **21st Floor**  **New York, NY 10017**  **212 500-5010 (Ph.)**  **212 208-6806 (Fax)** |
| **7-7-2017** | **10-CV-05711** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Kleen Products, et al. v. International Paper, et. al.**  **Re Defendants: Temple-Inland LLC and Weyerhaeuser Company**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants participated in an unlawful conspiracy to fix, raise, maintain, or stabilize the price of Containerboard Products at artificially high levels, including via various types of supply restrictions, in violation of U.S. antitrust laws. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Michael J. Freed**  **FREED KANNER LONDON & MILLEN**  **LLC**  **2201 Waukegan Road**  **Suite 130**  **Bannockburn, IL 60015**  **224 632-4500 (Ph.)**  **224 632-4521 (Fax)** |
| **7-10-2017** | **10-CV-05072**  **11-CV—3884** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Phillip Corvello v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.**  **Amira Jackmon v. America’s Servicing Company**  Plaintiffs allege that Wells Fargo’s use of the Home Affordable Modification Program (“HAMP”) Trial Period Plan (“TPP”) constituted an unlawful, unfair, fraudulent and deceptive debt collection practice and that Wells Fargo improperly collected HAMP TPP payments from the Class Members who received the TPP until 3-1-2010. The lawsuits also claimed that the TPP was a contract that Wells Fargo breached, but those “contract claims” were not certified for class action treatment. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**  [**WWW.CORVELLO-JACKMONHAMPCLASSACTION.COM**](http://WWW.CORVELLO-JACKMONHAMPCLASSACTION.COM) |
| **7-10-2017** | **15-CV-3783** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Sandra Butler, Ricky Gibson, O’Brien Morris, Richard Emmett, Roselle Diaz, Keven Faison, Shaniqua Jackson, Center for Independence of the Disabled, New York and Coalition for the Homeless v. City of New York, The New York City Department of Homeless Services and Steven Banks, as Commissioner of the New York City Department of Social Services**  Plaintiffs challenge the long-term, serious, and systemic failures of the City of New York and Steven Banks, as Commissioner of the New York City Department of Social Services to provide homeless men, women, and children with disabilities meaningful access to the shelters, programs, and services the New York City Department of Homeless Services (“DHS”) is obligated to provide. Due to a combination of inadequate policies, mismanagement, and poorly trained staff, Defendants have repeatedly discriminated against homeless New Yorkers with disabilities by failing to accommodate them throughout the shelter intake and placement process, and by relying upon methods of program administration that unfairly burden people with disabilities throughout various aspects of the shelter system’s operation. These failures have significant consequences for Plaintiffs’ health, safety, and quality of life. | **9-7-2017** | **For more information write, e-mail or call:**  **The Legal Aid Society**  **Butler v. City of**  **New York Settlement**  **199 Water Street**  **3rd Floor**  **New York, NY 10038**  [**ButlerCase@legal-aid.org**](mailto:ButlerCase@legal-aid.org)  **917 398-3055 (Ph.)** |
| **7-10-2017** | **16-CV-01125** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Honest Marketing Litigation**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendant has engaged in a campaign of labeling, marketing, and/or  advertising its products, with prominent representations that the Covered Products are “natural,” “all natural,” “naturally derived,” “plant-based,” and/or as containing “no harsh chemicals, ever!” as well as imagery and other representations that communicate a false message to consumers about the Covered Products. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendant falsely advertised and marketed its sunscreen as “effective” when it was not. Plaintiffs allege that as a result of seeing these false and misleading representations, Plaintiffs and consumers bought the Covered Products, paid more for the Covered Products than they otherwise would have paid absent the wrongful conduct, and have been damaged as a result of the wrongful conduct. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:**  **FINKELSTEIN, BLANKINSHIP,**  **FREIPEARSON & GARBER, LLP**  **Todd S. Garber**  **445 Hamilton Avenue**  **Suite 605**  **White Plains, NY 10601**  **914 298-3290 (Ph.)**  [**tgarber@fbfglaw.com**](mailto:tgarber@fbfglaw.com) |
| **7-10-2017** | **11-CV-1011** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **J.C. Penney Corporation, Inc.**  The lawsuit claims that JC Penney failed to pay California Part-Time Non-Management Associates all earned vacation pay at termination. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Huffman & Kostas**  **James C. Kostas**  **David Huffman**  **1441 State Street**  **San Diego, CA 92101**  **619 544-0880 (Ph.)**  **619 544-0892 (Fax)**  [**jkostas@aol.com**](mailto:jkostas@aol.com) |
| **7-10-2017** | **15-CV-00346** | **(E.D. Wash.)** | **Desio v. Emerson Electric Co. d/b/a InSinkErator**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants’ Filter Cartridges were unfit for their ordinary and intended use as water filters, and they were not of merchantable quality in that they were vulnerable by virtue of their defective design (and not due to any secondary cause) to fail and malfunction. As such, the Filter Cartridges were not merchantable at the time of purchase, in that they were not free from defects and not fit for their intended purpose, as warranted. As a result, Defendants breached their implied warranties to Plaintiff and the Class by manufacturing and selling Filter Cartridges with fundamental inherent defects. Additionally, Defendants knowingly allowed these warranties to be made to Plaintiff and the Class with the intent of inducing them to purchase the Filter Cartridges even after being put on notice by Plaintiff and other Class members of the defects inherent in those Filter Cartridges. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Steve W. Berman**  **Ari Y. Brown**  **HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO**  **LLP**  **1918 Eighth Avenue**  **Suite 3300**  **Seattle, WA 98101**  **206 623-7292 (Ph.)**  **206 623-0594 (Fax)**  [**steve@hbsslaw.com**](mailto:steve@hbsslaw.com)  [**ari@hbsslaw.com**](mailto:ari@hbsslaw.com) |
| **7-11-2017** | **16-CV-00037** | **(W.D.N.C.)** | **In re: CommunityOne Bancorp Consolidated Stockholders Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Capital Bank Financial Corp., CommunityOne Bancorp, Robert L. Reid, Scott B. Kauffman, Jerry R. Licari, J. Chandler Martin, T. Gray McCaskill, H. Ray McKenney, John C. Redett, Boyd C. Wilson, Jr.**  Plaintiffs allege that the Capital Bank Financial director defendants breached their fiduciary duties by approving the merger, that  CommunityOne aided and abetted such breaches, and that Capital Bank Financial, its directors and CommunityOne failed to disclose material information in connection with the merger. It is further alleged that certain defendants violated Sections 14(a) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by issuing a Registration/Joint Proxy Statement that, plaintiffs allege, is materially incomplete and misleading. The Garfield, Pendleton and Scrogham Actions seek, among other things, an order enjoining the merger. | **Not set yet**  **(check for date)** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **James M. Wilson, Jr.**  **Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP**  **685 Third Avenue, 26th Floor**  **New York, NY 10017**  **212 983-9330 (Ph.)**  **212 983-9331 (Fax)**  [**jwilson@faruqilaw.com**](mailto:jwilson@faruqilaw.com)  **Guri Ademi**  **Ademi & O'Reilly, LLP**  **3620 E. Layton Avenue**  **Cudahy, WI 53110**  **414 482-8000 (Ph.)**  **414 482-8001 (Fax)**  [**gademi@ademilaw.com**](mailto:gademi@ademilaw.com) |
| **7-11-2017** | **15-CV-01520**  **15-CV-03894** | **(E.D. Penn.)** | **Stokes v. RealPage, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that RealPage provided consumer reports which may have included information regarding criminal cases that had previously been expunged or sealed. Plaintiff claims RealPage’s procedures relating to these reports did not conform to the Fair Credit Reporting Act. |  | **For more information write to:**  **James Arthur Francis**  **John Soumilas**  **David A. Searles**  **Lauren K.W. Brennan**  **Francis & Mailman PC**  **Land Title Building**  **100 S. Broad Street**  **19th Floor**  **Philadelphia, PA 19110** |
| **7-13-2017** | **15-CV-13559**  **15-CV-04851** | **(S.D. W Va.)** | **Perez v. Charming Sales Co. One, Inc., et al.**  The Lawsuit alleges that Settling Defendants improperly demanded collection costs from West Virginia residents in collecting debts arising from the purchase of products from the Figi’s business. | **11-15-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **Ralph C. Young**  **Christopher B. Frost**  **Steven R. Broadwater, Jr.**  **Jed R. Nolan**  **Hamilton, Burgess, Young &**  **Pollard, PLLC**  **P.O. Box 959**  **Fayette, WV 25840** |
| **7-14-2017** | **10-CV-01993** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Rainbow Business Solutions, d/b/a Precision Tune Auto Care, et al. v. MBF Leasing LLC,**  **et al.**  Plaintiffs allege violations of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act and Fair Credit Reporting Act; fraud, deceit and/or misrepresentation; negligent misrepresentation; conversion; breach of contract; breach of the duty of good faith; false advertising under California Business and Professions Code sections 17500, *et seq.*; and unfair business practices under California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq*. On behalf of the Property Tax Equipment Cost Basis Class, Plaintiffs allege that during the period from 3-26-2006 to 2010, Leasing Defendants used an inflated cost basis to assess personal property taxes on leased equipment. In particular, Plaintiffs claim that Leasing Defendants did not use the actual “equipment cost” but rather an “acquisition cost” that improperly included commissions paid to sales agents, who induced class members to enter into the leases. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Adam Gutride**  **Kristen Simplicio**  **Gutride Safier LLP**  **100 Pine Street**  **Suite 1250**  **San Francisco, CA 94111**  **415 639-9090 (Ph.)**  **415 449-6469 (Fax)**  [**adam@gutridesafier.com**](mailto:adam@gutridesafier.com)  [**kristen@gutridesafier.com**](mailto:kristen@gutridesafier.com) |
| **7-14-2017** | **16-CV-03925** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Boland v. Gerdau S.A.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities  Exchange Act of 1934 by, *inter alia*, issuing false and misleading statements and/or failing to disclose that: (i) the Company was engaged in a bribery scheme in collusion with Brazil’s Board of Tax Appeals; (ii) Gerdau had defrauded Brazilian tax authorities of approximately 4 billion Brazilian reais in taxes; and (iii) directors and employees of the Company had engaged in bribery, money laundering and influence peddling. Lead Plaintiff alleges that as a result of these material misrepresentations and omissions, Gerdau ADRs traded at artificially inflated prices. | **10-20-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **ROBBINS GELLER**  **RUDMAN & DOWD LLP**  **ELLEN GUSIKOFF STEWART**  **655 West Broadway**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **7-14-2017** | **13-CV-03073** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Goldemberg v. Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that Johnson & Johnson made misstatements about its Aveeno Active Naturals Products by describing certain Aveeno Active Naturals Products as “natural” or “Active Naturals.” | **10-27-2017** | **For more information visit:**  [**www.AveenoActiveNaturalsSettlement.com**](http://www.AveenoActiveNaturalsSettlement.com)**.** |
| **7-14-2017** | **16-CV-2412** | **(W.D. Tenn.)** | **Brace v. Methodlist Le Bonheur Healthcare, et al.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants denied the Plan’s participants and beneficiaries the protections of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”) by claiming the Plan qualified as an ERISA exempt “church plan.” The complaint alleged that the Plan did not qualify as an ERISA exempt church plan. | **8-16-2017** | **For more information write or fax:**  **Douglas P. Needham**  **Mark P. Kindall**  **IZARD, KINDALL & RAABE, LLP**  **29 South Main Street**  **Suite 305**  **West Hartford, CT 06107**  **860 493-6290 (Fax)** |
| **7-14-2017** | **16-CV-00473** | **(N.D. Tex.)** | **Main v. American Airlines, Inc., et al.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 by offering American Beacon Funds in the Plan to the exclusion of more prudent alternative funds managed by investment managers not affiliated with American Airlines or American Beacon, and by offering mutual funds rather than other forms of investment products. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Kai Richter**  **NICHOLS KASTER, PLLP**  **4600 IDS Center**  **80 South 8th Street**  **Minneapolis, MN 55402**  **612 256-3200 (Ph.)**  **612 256-6870 (Fax)** |
| **7-17-2017** | **16-CV-00611**  **17-CV-00853** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **Nguyen v. Outerwall Inc.**  **Boyer v. Outerwall Inc.**  The lawsuits allege that Coinstar, LLC (fka Outerwall Inc.) violated federal law and California state law by offering services at self-service, touchscreen Coinstar Kiosks that were not independently useable by persons who are Legally Blind. |  | **For more information write, call or e-mail:**  **Gerald D. Wells, III**  **Stephen E. Connolly**  **Connolly Wells & Gray, LLP**  **2200 Renaissance Boulevard**  **Suite 275**  **King of Prussia, PA 19406**  **610 822 3700 (Ph.)**  [**gwells@cwglaw.com**](mailto:gwells@cwglaw.com)  [**sconnolly@cwglaw.com**](mailto:sconnolly@cwglaw.com) |
| **7-18-2017** | **15-CV-08006** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Troy Oglesby, Sr. v. The “Original” W. Hargrave Demolition Company Co., Inc.**  Plaintiffs had a vehicle towed by The  “Original” W. Hargrove Demolition Company, Inc. d/b/a Camden Towing, Inc. (“Hargrove”), pursuant to its contract with the City of Camden between 10-15-2013 and 11-4-2015, and were charged $160.00 for a flatbed tow for a vehicle not involved in an accident. | **10-17-2017** | **For more information write or call:**  **Lisa J. Rodriguez**  **Woodland Falls Corporate**  **Park**  **220 Lake Drive East**  **Suite 200**  **Cherry Hill, NJ 08002**  **856 482-5741 (Ph.)** |
| **7-21-2017** | **14-CV-01981** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Williams, et al. v. Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC**  This case asserted claims based on Wells Fargo’s alleged practice of requiring Financial Advisors (“FA”) Trainees to sign agreements to repay up to $55,500 in purported “training costs” as well as claims that FA Trainees worked hours for which they did not receive pay. Plaintiffs allege claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”), claiming Wells Fargo failed to properly compensate FA Trainees for all the overtime hours they worked and improperly attempted to recover training costs, resulting in improper deductions or repayment of wages and/or unpaid minimum wages. For FA Trainees who worked in Illinois, New York, California and Florida, the Lawsuit asserts similar state law unpaid wage claims. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:**  **Linda D. Friedman**  **Suzanne E. Bish**  **George Robot**  **Stowell & Friedman, LTD**  **303 W. Madison**  **Sute 2600**  **Chicago, ILL 60606**  **312 431-0888 (Ph.)**  [**SBish@sfltd.com**](mailto:SBish@sfltd.com)  [**GRobot@sfltd.com**](mailto:GRobot@sfltd.com) |
| **7-18-2017** | **14-CV-00722** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Montage Technology Group Limited Securities Litigation**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the federal securities laws by allegedly making false and misleading statements to the investing public as set forth in the Complaint. The Complaint alleges that during the Settlement Class Period, Defendants failed to disclose related party transactions that allegedly should have been disclosed under applicable law. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Laurence M. Rosen**  **355 South Grand Avenue Suite 2450**  **Los Angeles, CA 90071**  **213 785-2610 (Ph.)**  **213 226-2684 (Fax)**  [**lrosen@rosenlegal.com**](mailto:lrosen@rosenlegal.com) |
| **7-19-2017** | **16-CV-23607** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Black-Brown v. Terminix International Company Limited Partnership**  This lawsuit alleges that Terminix (“Defendant”) violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) by making automated and/or prerecorded payment and/or debt-collection telephone calls to the cell phones of called parties within the United States who did not give consent to receive such calls. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Jonathan Cohen**  **John Yanchunis**  **Morgan & Morgan Complex**  **Litigation Group**  **201 N. Franklin Street**  **7th Floor**  **Tampa, FL 33602** |
| **7-19-2017** | **14-CV-7126** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Alaska Electrical Pension Fund, et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., et al.**  **Re Defendants: HSBC Bank USA, N.A. (“HSBC”) and UBS AG (“UBS”), and together with HSBC, (the “Settling Defendants”)**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants conspired to manipulate the International Swaps and Derivatives Association Fix (“ISDAfix”) in at least three ways. First, the Defendant Banks conspired to manipulate the fixed swap rate just before the period during which ISDAfix was set. They did this by executing a series of rapid-fire transactions through ICAP and submitting executable bids and offers to ICAP – so-called “banging the close” – to push the rates to a particular level. By executing a large volume of transactions and submitting executable bids and offers in a short period just before ICAP released its reference rate, Defendants manipulated the starting rate on which ISDAfix was based. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **David W. Mitchell**  **ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN**  **& DOWD LLP**  **655 West Broadway Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **7-20-2017** | **16-CV-804**  **17-CV-318**  **14-CV-205** | **(E.D. Va.)**  **(N.D. Ill.)**  **(E.D. Va.)** | **Biber v. Pioneer Credit Recovery, Inc.**  **Kozak v. Pioneer Credit Recovery, Inc.**  **Biber, et al. v. General Revenue Corporation**  Plaintiffs allege that Pioneer and General Revenue Corporation violated a federal law, the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA"), 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.,* by threatening administrative wage garnishment without first giving you proper notice of your rights to demand documentation about your student loan and to demand a hearing before your wages could be garnished. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, fax or e-mail:**  **Brian L. Bromberg**  **BROMBERG LAW OFFICE, P.C.**  **26 Broadway**  **21st Floor**  **New York, New York 10004**  **212 248-7908 (Ph.)**  [**brian@bromberglawoffice.com**](mailto:brian@bromberglawoffice.com) |
| **7-20-2017** | **14-CV-7837** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Kelsey v. Allin, et al.**  **Re Defendants: Patrick J. Allin, Jillian Sheehan, and Textura Corporation**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the federal securities laws by making misrepresentations or omissions of material fact concerning Defendant Allin’s professional biography in Security Exchange Commission (“SEC”) filings. The complaint asserts that the alleged misstatements or omissions artificially inflated the price of Textura common stock, and that the common stock prices dropped in response to certain subsequent disclosures. | **11-15-2017** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Phillip Kim**  **The Rosen Law Firm, P.A.**  **275 Madison Avenue**  **34th Floor**  **New York, New York 10016**  **212 686-1060 (Ph.)**    **212 202-3827 (Fax)**  [**pkim@rosenlegal.com**](mailto:pkim@rosenlegal.com) |
| **7-20-2017** | **17-CV-2264** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Logan Landers, et al. v. Sony Mobile Communications (U.S.A.), Inc. and Sony Electronics**  Plaintiffs allege that certain Sony Mobile Devices are not waterproof and are not designed for or capable of ordinary underwater use. | **12-1-2017** | **For more information write, call, fax or visit:**  **Nancy A. Kulesa**  **Shannon L. Hopkins**  **Levi & Korsinsky LLP**  **30 Broad Street**  **24th Floor**  **New York, NY 10004**  **212 363-7500 (Ph.)**  **212 363-7171 (Fax)**  [**www.zlk.com**](http://www.zlk.com) |
| **7-20-2017** | **15-MD-02669** | **(E.D. Mo.)** | **In re: Ashley Madison Customer Data Security Breach Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Ruby Corp. (previously named Avid Life Media Inc.), Ruby Life Inc. (previously named Avid Dating Life Inc.), and Noel Biderman**  Plaintiffs allege violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act; violation of the Federal Stored Communications Act; negligence; negligence per se; breach of implied contract; breach of contract; unjust enrichment; negligent misrepresentation; violation of state consumer fraud and protection statutes; violation of the California Customer Records Act; and violation of state data breach notice statutes. | **11-20-2017** | **For more information visit:**  [**www.WebsiteDataBreach.com**](http://www.WebsiteDataBreach.com) |
| **7-20-2017** | **12-CV-6627** | **(D.N.J.)** | **In re: Azek Building Products, Inc. Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation**  Plaintiffs claim that CPG International, LLC (“CPG”) made misrepresentations about the qualities and attributes of certain legacy AZEK Decking that was sold at retail between 8-1-2007 and 12-31-2012. Plaintiffs claim that CPG represented in its marketing materials that AZEK Decking would not fade, stain, scratch or discolor. Plaintiffs claim that the Decking was prone to fade, stain, scratch or discolor and that CPG should have so informed its customers. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Jonathan Shub**  **KOHN SWIFT & GRAF, LLP**  **One South Broad Street**  **Suite 2100**  **Philadelphia, PA 19130**  **215 238-1700 (Ph.)** |
| **7-20-2017** | **16-CV-01051** | **(M.D. N.C.)** | **Heather Adams, et al. v. Sitel Operating Corporation**  Plaintiffs allege Work@Home agents were not paid for all work time, including time worked; 1) pre-shift, with respect to computer and program start-up/log-in activities; 2) post-shift, with respect to computer and program shutdown/log-out activities; and 3) mid-shift, with respect to technical disconnection issues and tasks performed during meal periods. Based on those allegations, Plaintiffs asserted claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”), 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.*; under common law contract principals; under The North Carolina Wage and Hour Act, N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 95-25.1 *et seq.*; and under the South Carolina Payment of Wages Act, S.C. Code Ann. § 41-10-10, *et seq.* | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Kevin Stoops**  **Jason Thompson**  **Sommers & Schwartz, P.C.**  **One Towne Square**  **Suite 1700**  **Southfield, MI 48076** |
| **7-24-2017** | **15-CV-05107** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Lucero v. SolarCity Corp.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendant SolarCity  Corp. (“SolarCity” or “Defendant”) made 10 robocalls to Plaintiff residential telephone in order to sell solar panels. These calls were made using a computer voice imitating a live call center representative. Plaintiff did not give SolarCity prior express written consent to make these calls. In fact, Plaintiff’s phone number is listed on the National Do Not Call Registry. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Bursor & Fisher, P.A.**  **L. Timothy Fisher**  **Annick M. Persinger**  **Yeremey O. Krivoshey**  **1990 North California Blvd.**  **Suite 940**  **Walnut Creek, CA 94596**  **925 300-4455 (Ph.)** |
| **7-26-2017** | **15-CV-81139** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Benjamin Hankinson, et al. v. R.T.G. Furniture Corp., et al.**  **Re Defendants: The Jeffrey Seaman 2009 Annuity Trust, RTG Furniture Corp. of Georgia, d/b/a Rooms to Go, Rooms to Go North Carolina Corp., d/b/a Rooms to Go, RTG Furniture of Texas, L.P., d/b/a Rooms To Go, RTG Texas Holding, Inc., and R.T.G. Furniture Corp. of Texas**  Plaintiffs allege that ForceField Protection Plans sold by Rooms To Go (“RTG”) to some customers who purchased leather or fabric upholstered furniture from an RTG store or online. Plaintiffs further allege that RTG did not professionally apply ForceField® stain protectant to furniture they purchased from RTG and that RTG engaged in other actionable conduct in the sale and fulfillment of ForceField Protection Plans. In addition, Plaintiffs did not agree to buy a ForceField Protection Plan, but was charged for it anyway. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Douglas J. McNamara**  **Eric A. Kafka**  **COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS &**  **TOLL PLLC**  **1100 New York Ave. NW**  **East Tower, 5th Floor**  **Washington, DC 20005**  **202 408-4600 (Ph.)** |
| **7-26-2017** | **10-MD-2143** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Optical Disk Drive Product Antitrust**  **Litigation**  **Re Defendants: TEAC Corporation and TEAC America, Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that Settling Defendants participated in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, or stabilize the price of optical ODDs at artificially high levels in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act and various state antitrust and consumer protection statutes. | **9-14-2017** | **For more information visit:**  [**www.OpticalDiskDriveAntitrust.com**](http://www.OpticalDiskDriveAntitrust.com) |
| **7-27-2017** | **10-MD-2143** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Optical Disk Drive Products Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Koninklijke Philips N.V., Lite-On Corporation, Philips & Lite-On digital Solutions Corp., and Philips & Lite-On digital Solutions USA, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants coordinated their efforts to stabilize prices by using several methods, including agreeing to the: (i) order in which competitors would finish during multi-party procurement events – such as electronic auctions – held by customers; (ii) minimum prices for ODDs, below which competitors would not quote to customers; and (iii) exchange of detailed competitive pricing information and critical intelligence about manufacturing capacity and quality issues. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Hagens Berman Sobol**  **Shapiro LLP**  **Shana E. Scarlett**  **Matthew Smith**  **715 Hearst Avenue**  **Suite 202**  **Berkeley, CA 94710**  **510 725-3000 (Ph.)**  **510 725-3001 (Fax.)** |
| **7-27-2017** | **15-CV-231** | **(E.D.N.C.)** | **Gary Childress, et al. v. Bank of America, N.A., et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that since 9-11-2001, Bank of America charged thousands of military customers excessive interest on their interest-bearing obligations, including mortgage and credit card accounts, and further tried to conceal the excess interest charges, in violation of the Service Members Civil Relief Act, 50 U.S.C. §§ 3901, et seq., the Truth in Lending Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1637(b), 1638(f), and 1639f, North Carolina’s Unfair and Deceptive Trade Practice Act, and common law, including breach of contract, negligence, and negligent misrepresentation, and seek an accounting and to impose a constructive trust based on the same, as alleged in Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Complaint. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Steve W. Berman**  **Shayne C. Stevenson**  **Hagens Berman Sobol**  **Shapiro LLP**  **1918 Eighth Avenue**  **Suite 3300**  **Seattle, WA 98101**  **Knoll D. Lowney**  **Smith & Lowney, PLLC**  **2317 E. John Street**  **Seattle, WA 98112** |
| **7-28-2017** | **15-CV-03831** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Robert A. Pastor, Scott M. Van Horn, Regina M. Florence, William E. Florence III, v. Bank of America, N.A.**  The lawsuit concerns whether Bank of America impermissibly accessed consumer credit reports to conduct Account Review Inquiries of Bank of America customers after their account relationships with Bank of America allegedly had ended. | **1-11-2018** | **For more information write to:**  **Joshua B. Swigart**  **David J. McGlothlin**  **HYDE & SWIGART**  **2221 Camino Del Rio South**  **Suite 101**  **San Diego, CA 92108-3551**  **619 233-7770 (Ph.)** |
| **7-28-2017** | **16-CV-445** | **(M.D.N.C.)** | **James Wilson v. Hatteras Financial Corp., et al.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated various provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 because the public disclosures Hatteras had made concerning the Proposed Transaction allegedly were false and misleading. The complaint in the State Court Action alleges that the Directors breached their fiduciary duties by approving the Proposed Transaction and making public disclosures concerning the Proposed Transaction that allegedly were false and misleading. The complaint in the State Court Action alleges that Hatteras, Annaly and Merger Sub aided and abetted those alleged breaches of fiduciary duty. | **11-8-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **James M. Wilson, Jr.**  **FARUQI & FARUQI, LLP**  **685 Third Avenue**  **26th Floor**  **New York, NY 10017** |
| **7-28-2017** | **09-MD-02063** | **(D. Colo.)** | **In re: Oppenheimer Rochester Funds Group Securities Litigation**  The Plaintiff alleged a series of material misstatements and omissions in the Fund’s offering documents issued during the Class Period relating to the Defendants’; (1) failure to adhere to the Fund’s stated investment objective of seeking the highest tax free income consistent with the preservation of capital; (2) over -concentration of the Fund’s assets in non-investment grade (“junk”) bonds; (3) over-concentration of the Fund’s assets in bonds exposed to the risk of California’s real estate industry; and (4) excessive (and underreported) use of leverage through the Fund’s investments in inverse floaters and borrowing. The offering documents at issue in the case are: the Fund’s registration statements, prospectuses and statements of additional information (“SAIs”) filed with the Securities Exchange Comission on 9-27-2006, 3-8-2007 (revised prospectus) and 10-31-2007. The Plaintiff alleges that the offering documents materially understated the risks of investing in the Fund, causing losses to Class Members once those risks materialized. | **11-6-2017** | **For more information write or call:**  **Alan W. Sparer**  **Marc Haber**  **Michael L. Gallo**  **Sparer Law Group**  **100 Pine Street**  **33rd Floor**  **San Francisco, CA 94111**    **415 217-7300 (Ph.)** |
| **7-28-2017** | **16-CV-00102** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **Bai v. TCP International Holdings Ltd., et al.**  **Re Defendants: Karel Robert Den DAAS, Ellis Yan, and Brian Catlett**  Plaintiff alleges violations of the Federal Securities Laws (specifically Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. §78j(b) and 78(t)(a)) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder (17 CFR §240.10b-5)) against Defendants. The lawsuit claims that Defendants misled investors by making false and/or misleading statements and/or failing to disclose that: (i) TCPI’s Chairman, defendant Yan had made improper payments with his personal funds relating to TCPI’s business; (ii) improper relationships existed between Yan and the Company’s Vice-Chairman, Zhaoling Yan, and certain vendors; and (iii) as a result of the foregoing, Defendants’ statements about TCPI’s business, operations, and prospects were false and misleading and/or lacked a reasonable basis. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Leigh Handelman Smollar**  **Pomerantz LLP**  **10 South LaSalle Street**  **Suite 3505**  **Chicago, IL 60603**  **312 377-1181 (Ph.)** |
| **7-31-2017** | **15-CV-04062** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Daniel Matera and Susan Rashkis v. Google Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that Google applies automated processing to scan the content of emails sent by non-Gmail users to a Gmail account, while those emails are still in transit, and uses information obtained from the scanning for advertising purposes including creating user profiles of the Gmail users. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Michael W. Sobol**  **LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &**  **BERNSTEIN LLP**  **275 Battery Street**  **29th Floor**  **San Francisco, CA 94111**  **415 956-1000 (Ph.)** |
| **7-31-2017** | **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: JPMorgan Chase & Co., JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Association, and J.P. Morgan Securities plc**  Plaintiffs allege that each Defendant, from 2-1-2006 through 6-30-2011, inclusive, manipulated or aided and abetted the manipulation of Yen LIBOR, Euroyen TIBOR, and the prices of Euroyen-Based Derivatives. Defendants allegedly did so by using several means of manipulation. For example, panel banks that made the daily Yen LIBOR and/or Euroyen TIBOR submissions to the  British Bankers’ Association and Japanese Bankers’ Association (the “Contributor Bank Defendants”), such as Deutsche Bank AG and  JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., allegedly falsely reported their cost of borrowing in order to financially benefit their Euroyen-Based  Derivatives positions. Contributor Bank Defendants also allegedly requested that other Contributor Bank Defendants make false Yen  LIBOR and Euroyen TIBOR submissions on their behalf to benefit their Euroyen-Based Derivatives positions and used inter-dealer  brokers, intermediaries between buyers and sellers in the money markets and derivatives markets, to manipulate Yen LIBOR, Euroyen TIBOR, and the prices of Euroyen-Based Derivatives by disseminating false “Suggested LIBORs,” publishing false market rates on broker screens, and publishing false bids and offers into the market. Plaintiffs have asserted legal claims under various theories, including federal antitrust law, the Commodity Exchange Act, the Racketeering Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, and common law. | **11-9-2017**  **11-10-2017** | **For more information call:**  **866 217-4453 (Ph.)** |
| **7-31-2017** | **15-CV-00871** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Sonterra Capital Mater Fund, Ltd., et al. v. Credit Suisse Group AG, et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants and their unnamed co-conspirators entered into and engaged in a combination and conspiracy in an unreasonable and unlawful restraint of trade to fix the prices of Swiss franc-based derivatives in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.* Such contracts, combination and conspiracy included a continuing agreement, understanding or concerted action between and among Defendants and their co-conspirators in furtherance of which Defendants fixed, maintained or made artificial the prices of Swiss franc LIBOR-based derivatives. Defendants’ price-fixing conspiracy is a *per se* violation of the federal antitrust laws and are, in any event, unreasonable and unlawful restraints of trade. | **Not set yet** | **For more information wirte or call:**  **Lowey Dannenberg Cohen &**  **Hart, P.C.**  **Vincent Briganti**  **44 South Broadway**  **Suite 1100**  **White Plains, NY 10601**  **914 997-0500 (Ph.)**  **914 997-0035 (Fax)** |