| **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **6-1-2017** | **14-CV-04471** | **(S.D.N.Y)** | **In re: China Mobile Games & Entertainment Group, Ltd. Securities Litigation**  Plaintiff asserted claims against the China Mobile Games & Entertainment Group (“CMGE”)  Defendants under Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, against the Individual Defendants under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act, and against all Defendants (except Ying) under Sections 11 and 15 of the Securities Act. Among other things, the Consolidated Complaint alleged that during the Class Period, Defendants made false and materially misleading statements regarding undisclosed related-party transactions with Shenzhen Zhongzheng Ruanyin Science & Technology Co., Ltd. (“Zhongzheng”) and CMGE’s alleged acts of bribery to carry favor with key distributors. The Consolidated Complaint also alleged that Defendants made false and misleading statements in the Secondary Offering documents disseminated in connection with CMGE’s public offering held on or about 3-26-2014. The Consolidated Complaint also alleges that when the market learned of the Company’s misrepresentations and omissions, the price of CMGE ADS fell, causing damage to purchasers of the Company’s stock during the Class Period. | **9-22-2017**  Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more information write or visit:**  **GLANCY PRONGAY &**  **MURRAY LLP**  **Kara M. Wolke**  **1925 Century Park East**  **Suite 2100**  **Los Angeles, CA 90067**  [**www.strategicclaims.net/cmge**](http://www.strategicclaims.net/cmge) |
| **6-1-2017** | **15-CV-08395** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Rito, et al. v. Castella Imports, Inc. and Castello Imports II, LLC**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendant Castella Imports, Inc. marketed substandard or adulterated extra virgin olive oil under various brand names and/or provided insufficient or misleading storage instructions and information. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Randee Matloff**  **Nagel RiceLLP**  **103 Eisenhower Parkway**  **Roseland, NJ 07068** |
| **6-5-2017** | **16-CV-08412** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Ferrick v. Spotify USA Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that they own copyrights for which registration has been issued or applied for in musical compositions that Spotify made available for interactive streaming and/or limited downloading without a license, and that Spotify did so with respect to other musical compositions owned by others. The plaintiffs allege that Spotify is liable to the Settlement Class for copyright infringement in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§ 101 et seq. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Henry Gradstein**  **Maryann R. Marzano**  **Gradstein & Marzano, P.C.**  **6310 San Vicente Boulevard Suite 510**  **Los Angeles, CA 90048** |
| **6-5-2017** | **16-CV-60661** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **In re: DS Healthcare Group, Inc. Securities Litigation**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the federal securities laws by making misrepresentations or omissions of material fact concerning improper revenue recognition, violations of corporate by-laws and related party transactions. The complaint asserts that the alleged misstatements artificially inflated the price of DS Healthcare securities and the price of DS Healthcare securities dropped in response to certain subsequent disclosures. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Laurence M. Rosen**  **The Rosen Law Firm, P.A.**  **275 Madison Avenue**  **34th Floor**  **New York, NY 10016** |
| **6-5-2017** | **14-CV-00807** | **(D. Md.)** | **Freckleton v. Target Corporation**  The lawsuit claims that Target violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act (“FCRA”)—which sets forth the procedure that employers must follow when they obtain and use background checks to make employment decisions. The FCRA requires employers to disclose that they intend to conduct a background check for employment purposes and to obtain an individual’s permission beforehand. The FCRA also requires that the disclosure be in a separate document with no language other than the disclosure itself and the authorization. This lawsuit alleges that Target provided a disclosure that contained additional, extraneous language beyond the disclosure and the authorization. The FCRA also requires that employers provide adequate notice to a job applicant before taking an adverse action, such as not hiring the job applicant, because of the information in a background check. This lawsuit alleges that Target did not provide adequate notice to job applicants before taking an adverse action. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:**  **James A. Francis**  **FRANCIS & MAILMAN, P.C.**  **100 South Broad Street, Suite 1902**  **Philadelphia, PA 19110**  [**info@consumerlawfirm.com**](mailto:info@consumerlawfirm.com) |
| **6-5-2017** | **13-CV-00206** | **(E.D. Mo.)** | **Downing, et al. v. Goldman Phipps PLLC, et al.**  **Re Defendants: Goldman Pennebaker & Phillips, P.C., and Martin J. Phillips, Stephen B. Murray, Sr. and the Murray Law Firm**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants were unjustly enriched in their state court cases by the work performed in the federal MDL lawsuit against Bayer and by the money paid into the Common Benefit Fund. The lawsuit also alleges a claim under the legal doctrine known as quantum meruit based on the same conduct and seeking the same or similar relief. | **9-8-2017** | **For more information call or visit:**  **1-866-501-9325 (Ph.)**  [**www.riceunjustenrichment.com**](http://www.riceunjustenrichment.com) |
| **6-6-2017** | **`**  **08-CV-03369** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Google AdWords Litigation**  For more information see CAFA Notice dated 3-6-2017. | **7-27-2017** | **For more information visit:**  [**https://adwordsclassaction.com**](https://adwordsclassaction.com) |
| **6-7-2017** | **13-CV-00468** | **(D.N.M.)** | **Smith, et al. v. Hess Corporation**  Plaintiffs state that they and class Members are royalty and overriding royalty interest owners in the West Bravo Dome Unit in Harding County, New Mexico, whose royalty and overriding royalty interest apply to leases held and operated by Hess. Plaintiffs claim that they and all class members have been damaged because Hess underpaid royalty and overriding royalty due for CO2 from the unit. | **9-5-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **J.E. Gallegos**  **Gallegos Law Firm, P.C.**  **460 St. Michael’s Drive**  **Santa Fe, NM 87505** |
| **6-8-2017** | **16-CV-01478** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Youngman v. A&B Insurance and Financial Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that, on or after 8-18-2012, A&B Insurance violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act by making calls to cellular telephones through the use of an automatic telephone dialing system, or an artificial or prerecorded voice, or to telephone numbers that were listed on the National Do-Not-Call Registry. The class representatives claim that A&B Insurance did not have the recipients’ permission to make these calls. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:**  **Anthony Paronich, Broderick**  **& Paronich**  **99 High Street**  **Suite 304**  **Boston, MA 02110**  [**anthony@broderick-law.com**](mailto:anthony@broderick-law.com)**.** |
| **6-8-2017** | **16-CV-00366** | **(W.D. Tex.)** | **Philip Bell v. Adler Wallach & Associates, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that Adler Wallach Associates, Inc. violated a federal law known as the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, and a Texas law known as the Texas Debt Collection Practices Act, by mailing collection letters to Texas residents that (i) misidentified the creditor as “Automobile Club,” and (ii) sought to collect “Interest & Fees” that were not permitted by contract or law. | **9-6-2017** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Philip D. Stern**  **Andrew T. Thomasson**  **STERN•THOMASSON LLP**  **150 Morris Avenue**  **2nd Floor**  **Springfield, NJ 07081-1315**  **973 665-2056 (Ph.)**  **973 532-5868 (Fax)** |
| **6-9-2017** | **14-CV-10136** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Weston v. RCS Capital Corp., et al.**  This action arises from an alleged accounting fraud at American Realty Capital Properties, Inc. (“ARCP”), a public real estate investment trust that shared a number of directors with RCS Capital Corp., (“RCAP”), which was allegedly perpetrated and concealed by Defendant Schorsch (co-founder of RCAP and Executive Chairman of RCAP’s board of directors) and other senior management of ARCP, RCAP is a wholesale broker-dealer and investment banking and advisory business, with the majority of its revenues during the Class Period generated from services provided to AR Capital, LLC (“ARC”), a real estate management company that also shared a number of directors with RCS. Those services include the wholesale distribution of ARC’s investment products. Throughout the Class Period, Defendants, among other things, allegedly made false and misleading statements and omissions regarding the strength of RCAP’s business prospects, emphasizing RCAP’s ability to leverage its relationship with Schorsch-related entities. | **6-20-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **Labaton Sucharow LLP**  **Ira A. Schochet**  **140 Broadway**  **New York, NY 10005** |
| **6-9-2017** | **14-CV-05615** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **McKnight, et al. v. Uber Technologies, Inc.,**  **et al.**  **Philliben, et al. v. Uber Technologies, Inc.,**  **et al.**  Plaintiff alleges that Uber made misrepresentations or omissions regarding the “Safe Rides Fee,” safety measures, and the background check process for potential drivers. The lawsuit asserted a number of causes of action, including Breach of Implied Contract, alleged violations of California’s Consumers Legal Remedies Act (Cal. Civ. Code § 1750 *et seq*.), California’s Unfair Competition Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 *et seq.*), California’s False Advertising Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 *et seq.*), and other violations of law. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call:**  **1 877 797-6083 (Ph.)** |
| **6-12-2017** | **15-CV-04010** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Calfo v. John P. Messina, Sr.**  **Re Defendants: Michael J. Golde, Joseph Cassera, Robert Cassera, James Altucher, James Foley, Karen Amato, Thomas J. Clarke, Jr., Larry Melby, Sylvan Holzer, and Corporate Resource Services, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated certain federal securities laws by making misrepresentations or omissions of material fact concerning Corporate Resource Services, Inc. (“CRS”) material tax withholding liability. It is further alleged that on 8-14-2015, Plaintiffs filed the Amended Class Action Complaint (“Complaint”), with a Settlement class period from 4-26-2012 to 3-20-2015. The 4-26-2012 start date to the Settlement Class Period was based on allegations regarding the failure of CRS and Defendants Cassera, Golde, and Messina to disclose the existence of a material tax-withholding liability during the Settlement Class Period. The Settlement Class Period end on 3-20-2015, when the last of eight days of separate disclosures causing a decline in CRS’ share price was made public. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Jeremy A. Lieberman**  **Justin S. Nematzadeh**  **POMERANTZ LLP**  **600 Third Avenue**  **20th Floor**  **New York, NY 10016** |
| **6-14-2017** | **14-CV-02031** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Mary Lou Ayala, et al. v. Coach, Inc., et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that Coach did not provide proper meal and rest breaks and owes wages as a result of conducting security checks on employees who bring bags or coats to work when they later leave the store with those items; and that Coach did not properly calculate overtime pay. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**  [**www.coachsettlement.com**](http://www.coachsettlement.com) |
| **6-14-2017** | **16-ML-02719** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **In re: The Honest Company, Inc., Sodium Lauryl Suffate (SLS) Marketing & Sales Practices Litigation**  The lawsuits allege that Honest Company, Inc. (“Honest”) engaged in unfair and deceptive marketing and advertising by referring to the Honest multi-surface cleaner (regular and concentrate), dish soap (regular and concentrate, all scents) and laundry detergent as being “free” of sodium lauryl sulfate or SLS, when they allegedly contained SLS. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **SULLIVAN, KRIEGER, TRUONG,**  **SPAGNOLA & KLAUSNER, LLP**  **Adam M. Tamburelli**  **Eliot F. Krieger**  **Charles T. Spagnola**  **444 West Ocean Boulevard Suite 1700**  **Long Beach, CA 90802**  **562 597-7070 (Ph.)** |
| **6-14-2017** | **13-CV-03073** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Goldemberg v. Johnson & Johnson Consumer Company**  Plaintiffs allege 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 write to:**  **Todd S. Garber**  **Finkelstein, Blankinship,**  **Frei-Pearson & Garber, LLP**  **445 Hamilton Avenue**  **Suite 605**  **White Plains, NY 10601** |
| **6-14-2017** | **15-CV-03462** | **(N.D. Ga.)** | **Abante Rooter and Plumbing, Inc. v. Birch Communications, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that Birch Communications violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act by making calls to cellular telephones through the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice to telephone numbers that were listed on the National Do-Not-Call Registry. The class representative claims that Birch Communications did not have the recipients’ permission to make these calls. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Edward Broderick**  **Anthony Paronich**  **BRODERICK & PARONICH, P.C.**  **99 High Street**  **Suite 304**  **Boston, Massachusetts 02110** |
| **6-15-2017** | **12-CV-1025** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Gelboim, et al. v. Credit Suisse Group, et al.**  **Re Defendant: Barclays Bank PLC**  Plaintiffs allege antitrust violations in connection with Barclays’ and other banks’ USD LIBOR submissions during the August 2007 through May 2010 class period. The action was brought by Plaintiffs on behalf of a putative class of investors who transacted USD LIBOR-linked debt securities during the Class Period. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Saxena White P.A.**  **Joseph E. White, III**  **5200 Town Center Circle Suite 601**  **Boca Raton, FL 33486** |
| **6-16-2017** | **6-CV-60165** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **In re: Home Loan Servicing Solutions, Ltd. Securities Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Home Loan Servicing Solutions, Ltd., James E. Lauter, and John P. Van Vlack**  Plaintiff alleges that Home Loan Servicing Solutions (“HLSS”) and the Individual Defendants under Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, and against the Individual Defendants under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. The Consolidated Complaint alleged, among other things, that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements and omitted material information regarding the nature of the relationship and business dealings between HLSS – a company created by Defendant Erbey to acquire mortgage servicing assets – and Ocwen, the largest nonbank mortgage servicer in the country and HLSS’s main source for purchasing mortgage servicing assets. Specifically, the Consolidated Complaint alleged, that HLSS and Ocwen engaged in related-party transactions that were supposedly approved by Defendant Erbey – who was a founder, former Chairman, and had an ownership interest in both companies – in violation of Defendants’ representations that Erbey recused himself from negotiations and approvals of transactions between HLSS and Ocwen. The  Consolidated Complaint also contained allegations concerning the (i) effectiveness of HLSS’s mortgage servicing technology platform, (ii) HLSS’s representations that no legal or contingent matter existed that would materially impact HLSS’s business or financials, and (iii) the Company’s compliance with United States Generally Accepted Accounting Practices (“GAAP”). The Amended Complaint further alleged that the price of HLSS common stock was artificially inflated as a result of Defendants’ allegedly false and misleading statements and omissions, and that the price declined when the truth was revealed. | **11-17-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **Saxena White P.A.**  **Joseph E. White, III**  **5200 Town Center Circle**  **Suite 601**  **Boca Raton, FL 33486** |
| **6-16-2017** | **12-CV-05746** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Charvat v. Resort Marketing Group, et al.**  **Re Defendants: Carnival Corporation & PLC, Royal Caribbean Cruises, Ltd. and NCL (Bahamas) Ltd.**  Plaintiff alleges that RMG made pre-recorded telemarketing calls to landlines and cell phones offering free cruises with Carnival, Royal Caribbean, and Norwegian as promotions and that these calls violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. The lawsuit alleges that Carnival, Royal Caribbean, and Norwegian authorized RMG to make these calls on their behalf. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Matthew P. McCue**  **Law Office of**  **Matthew P. McCue**  **1 South Avenue**  **Suite 3**  **Natick, MA 01760** |
| **6-19-2017** | **16-CV-03502** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation, Interior Trim Products (Automobile Dealership Action)**  **Re Defendants: INOAC Group North America, LLC, and INOAC USA Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants participated in a conspiracy to suppress and eliminate competition by agreeing to allocate sales of, to rig bids for and to fix, stabilize, and maintain the prices of certain Plastic Interior Trim Automotive Parts sold to Toyota Motor Corporation and certain of its subsidiaries and affiliates in the U.S. and elsewhere, from at least as early as June 2004 until at least September 2012, in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. | **Not set yet** | **For more informatino write to:**  **BARRETT LAW GROUP, P.A**  **P.O. Box 927**  **404 Court Square**  **Lexington, MS 39095** |
| **6-20-2017** | **15-CV-80029** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Tom Mahoney v. TT of Pine Ridge, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that TT of Pine Ridge,  Inc. (d/b/a Naples Nissan) (“Defendant”) violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act by making unsolicited calls through the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **THE LAW OFFICE OF**  **CHRIS R. MILTENBERGER, PLLC**  **Chris R. Miltenberger**  **1340 N. White Chapel Blvd. Suite 100**  **Southlake, TX 76092** |
| **6-21-2017** | **12-MD-2311**  **13-CV-01203**  **13-CV-1703** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **In re: Automotive Lamps Cases**  **In re: HID Ballasts Cases**  **Re Defendants: Koito Manufacturing Co., Ltd. and North American Lighting Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of KOITO’s participation in alleged unlawful conspiracies to raise, fix, maintain, and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for Automotive Lamps and HID Ballasts in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act and various state antitrust, unfair competition, unjust enrichment, and consumer protection laws as set forth in End-Payor Plaintiffs’ Second Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaints for Damages and Injunctive Relief. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Cotchett, Pitre, & McCarthy**  **LLP**  **San Francisco Airport Office**  **Center**  **840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200**  **Burlingame, CA 94010**  **Robins Kaplan LLP**  **399 Park Avenue**  **Suite 3600**  **New York, NY 10022** |
| **6-29-2017** | **12-CV-00500**  **12-CV-00501**  **12-CV-12068** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Schaeffler Group USA Inc., Schaeffler Technologies AG & Co. KG, FAG Kugelfischer GmbH and DALC Gear & Bearing Supply Corp.**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants participated in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for Bearings, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, as set forth in Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Class Action Complaint filed in the Initial Bearings Action and the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs’ Class Action Complaint filed in the DALC Gear & Bearing Supply Corp., et al. v. France SA, et al., 15—CV-12068 action. | **Not set yet** | **For more information writeor call:**  **Solomon B. Cera**  **CERA LLP**  **595 Market Street Suite 2300**  **San Francisco, CA 94105**  **415 777-2230 (Ph.)**  **Manuel J. Dominguez**  **Cohen Milstein Sellers &**  **Toll, PLLC**  **2925 PGA Boulevard**  **Suite 200**  **Palm Beach Gardnens FL 33410**  **877 515-7955 (Ph.)** |
| **6-22-2017** | **09-CV-01247**  **16-CV-00907** | **(E.D. Cal.)** | **Arredondo, et al. v. Delano Farms Company,**  **et al.**  **Paniagua v. Delano Farms Company, et al.**  Plaintiffs did agricultural work while employed by the contractors at Delano Farms, at some time from 7-17-2005 to 2-15-20017. Plaintiffs allege that they are entitled to unpaid wages, interest, penalties, and other damages based on the work they performed, including compensation for work performed off the clock, reimbursement for money spent to purchase tools, and compensation for rest breaks. | **9-22-2017** | **For more information call or visit:**  **1 844 540-6006 (Ph.)**  [**www.delanofarmsacuerdo.com**](http://www.delanofarmsacuerdo.com) |
| **6-22-2017** | **06-CV-6213** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **In re Northrop Grumman Corporation ERISA Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Northrop Grumman Corporation Administrative Committees to the Northrop Grumman Saving Plan and Financial Security and Savings Program, J. Michael Hateley, Ian Ziskin, and Dennis Wootan**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated 29 U.S.C. §1104 and §1106 by improperly distributing plan assets in the form of administrative expenses to Northrop Grumman for services performed by Northrop Grumman employees, which Class Representative contend constituted prohibited transactions. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, e-mail, call or fax:**  **Schlichter,Bogard & Denton**  **Attn:Northrop Grumman 401(k)**  **Settlement**  **100 S. Fourth Street**  **Suite 1200**  **St.Louis , MO 63102**  [**Northrop401ksettlement@uselaws.com**](mailto:Northrop401ksettlement@uselaws.com)  **314 621-6115 (Ph.)**  **314 621-5934 (Fax)** |
| **6-22-2017** | **16-CV-00295** | **(W.D. Wis.)** | **Farnham v. Caribou Coffee Company, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendant sent text messages to wireless telephone numbers without prior express written consent of the recipients in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C.§ 227. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **David P. Milian**  **Frank S. Hedin**  **Carey Rodriguez Milian**  **Gonya, LLP**  **1395 Brickell Avenue**  **Suite 700**  **Miami, Florida 33131** |
| **6-22-2017** | **14-CV-05263** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Edward Todd v. STAAR Surgical Company, et al.**  **Re Defendants: STAAR Surgical Company (“STAAR”), Barry G. Caldwell, and John Santos**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the federal securities laws by allegedly making false and misleading statements to the investing public concerning STAAR’s compliance with regulations promulgated by the Food Drug Administration. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call**  **Michael J. Wernke**  **Pomerantz LLP**  **600 Thrid Avenue**  **20th Floor**  **New York, NY 10016**  **212 661-1100 (Ph.)** |
| **6-23-2017** | **15-CV-01970** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Resonant Inc. Securities Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Resonant Inc., Terry Lingren and John Philpott**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated Sections 10(b) and Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act of 1934. According to the Second Amended Complaint, Defendants violated these statutes by disseminating materially misleading statements about the Company’s ability to complete its core product, the Skyworks Duplexer. Specifically, the Second Amended Complaint alleges that Defendants failed to disclose: (1) the specifications that the Skyworks Duplexer was required to meet; (2) the fact that Resonant could not meet Skyworks’ requisite performance specifications for the Duplexer; and (3) that the final version of the Duplexer submitted to Skyworks was known to be non-compliant with Skyworks’ stated specifications. When this information became public, the Second Amended Complaint alleges that the share price declined and shareholders were damaged. The lawsuit seeks monetary damages against Defendants for alleged violations of the federal securities laws. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Nicholas I. Porritt**  **LEVI & KORSINSKY LLP**  **1101 30th Street NW**  **Washington, D.C. 20007** |
| **6-23-2017** | **13-CV-00736** | **(E.D. Tex.)** | **Marcus, et al. v. J.C. Penney Company, Inc., et al.**  **Re Defendants: Myron E. Ullman, II, and Kenneth H. Hannah**  Plaintiffs allege that JCPenney and certain of its current officers and/or directors were in violation of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “1934 Act”). These claims are asserted against JCPenney and certain of its officers and/or directors who made materially false and misleading statements during the Class Period in press releases, analyst conference calls, and filings with the SEC. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN**  **& DOWD LLP**  **JONAH H. GOLDSTEIN**  **ROBERT R. HENSSLER JR.**  **655 West Broadway**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **6-23-2017** | **14-CV-00020**  **14-CV-01968** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Melita Meyer v. bebe Stores, Inc.**  **Samantha Rodriguez v. bebe Stores, Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that bebe violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act by sending SMS or text messages without the required consent. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Payam Shahian**  **Strategic Legal**  **Practices, APC**  **1840 Century Park East**  **Suite 430**  **Los Angheles, CA 90067** |
| **6-23-2017** | **15-CV-09171** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Belevich v. Bank of America, N.A.**  Plaintiff alleges claims for: (1) failure to provide meal periods; (2) failure to furnish timely and accurate wage statements; (3) failure to pay wages due upon termination; (4) unlawful and/or unfair business practices and; (5) civil penalties under Private Attorney General Act for the Labor Code violations alleged in the first three causes of action. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Matthew Righetti**  **Michael Righetti**  **Righetti Glugoski, P.C.**  **456 Montgomery Street**  **Suite 1400**  **San Francisco, CA 94104**  **415 983-0900 (Ph.)**  **415 397-9005 (Fax)** |
| **6-23-2017** | **05-CV-1070**  **05-CV-1073**  **05-CV-7821**  **06-CV-3924**  **05-CV-1172**  **06-CV-5060** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Terri N. White, et al. v. Experian Information**  **Solutions, Inc.**  **Terri N. White, et al. v. TransUnion LLC**  **Terri N. White, et al. v. Equifax Information**  **Services LLC, et al. (EIS)**  **Jose Hernandez, et al. v. EIS, LLC, et al.**  **Dennis Pike v. EIS, LLC, et al.**  **Jose L. Acosta, Jr., et al. v. TransUnion LLC**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the Fair Credit Report Act (“FCRA”) and related state laws by failing to follow reasonable procedures to assure maximum possible accuracy in the reporting of debts discharged in bankruptcy and failing to properly reinvestigate disputes made by consumers regarding such debts. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants were erroneously reporting those kinds of debts as in collection or due and owing on their credit reports, when they should have been reported as included in bankruptcy, and that when consumers disputed such reporting, Defendants failed to properly reinvestigate such disputes. Plaintiffs allege in the lawsuit that a credit report contained an “error” if an account or judgment which was discharged in a Chapter 7 bankruptcy was reported with information indicating that such debt was due and owing. | **12-11-2017** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Michael A. caddell**  **Cynthia B. Chapman**  **Amy E. Tabor**  **Caddell & Chapman**  **628 East 9th Street**  **Houston, TX 77007-1722**  **713 751-0400 (Ph.)**  **713 751-0906 (Fax)**  **Michael W. Sobol**  **Lieff, Cabraser Heimann &**  **Bernstein, LLP**  **Embarcadero Center West**  **275 Battery Street**  **29th Floor**  **San Francisco CA 94111-3339**  **415 956-1000 (Ph.)**  **415 956-1008 (Fax)** |
| **6-26-2017** | **15-CV-06457** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Rachel Cody, et al. v. SoulCycle Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that SoulCycle’s sale of indoor cycling Classes constitutes the sale of “gift certificates” as defined under California and federal law and that the expiration dates contained on SoulCycle’s Classes violate the Electronic Funds Transfer Act, 15 U.S.C. §1693, *et seq*., as amended by the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009 (the “CARD Act”), 15 U.S.C. § 1693l-1, and the California Gift Card Statute, California Civil Code Section 1750, *et seq*., as well as consumer statutes of California, including the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act and the California Unfair Competition Law. | **10-2-2017** | **For more information call or visit:**  **1-855-234-7127**  [**www.CycleClassAction.com**](http://www.CycleClassAction.com) |
| **6-26-2017** | **12-CV-07849** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Majdipour, et al. v. Jaguar Land Rover North America, LLC**  The lawsuit claimed that Model Year 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 Land Rover Range Rover vehicles were sold or leased to consumers with a defect in the front air springs in the electronic air suspension. Plaintiffs claimed that, as a result of the alleged defect, the front air springs can crack or fail, causing a loss of air pressure in the suspension system. Plaintiffs alleged that, to correct the purported defect, owners or lessees of the vehicles incurred costs to replace the front air springs. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Mazie, Slater, Katz &**  **Freeman, LLC**  **103 Eisenhower Parkway Roseland, NJ 07068**  **Strategic Legal**  **Practices, APC**  **1840 Century Park E #430**  **Los Angeles, CA 90067** |
| **6-26-2017** | **15-CV-02546** | **(D. Colo.)** | **Medina v. Clovis Oncology, Inc., et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that the Officer Defendants under Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, against the Officer Defendants under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. The Consolidated Complaint also asserted claims under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the “Securities Act”), arising from Clovis’ 7-14-2015 secondary offering of common stock (the “Secondary Offering”). Specifically, the Consolidated Complaint asserted (i) claims under Section 11 of Securities Act against Clovis, Patrick J. Mahaffy (“Mahaffy”), and Erle T. Mast (“Mast”), and the Underwriter Defendants; (ii) claims under Section 12(a)(2) of the Securities Act against Clovis and the Underwriter Defendants; and (iii) claims under Section 15 of the Securities Act against Mahaffy, Mast, and the Venture Capital  Defendants. | **10-2-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **Bernstein Litowitz Berger &**  **Grossmann LLP**  **John C. Browne**  **1251 Avenue of the Americas**  **44th Floor**  **New York, NY 10020** |
| **6-26-2017** | **16-CV-00278** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Elder v. Hilton Worldwide Holdings, Inc., et al.**  **Re Defendants: Premier Getaways, Inc., and Blackhawk Engagement Solutions, Inc.**  This lawsuit claims that Hilton improperly rejected $100 and $200 Spend A Night On Us certificates provided to people who attended timeshare presentations offered by Hilton. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **L. Timothy Fisher**  **Bursor & Fisher, P.A.**  **1990 North California Blvd. Suite 940**  **Walnut Creek, CA 94596** |
| **4-3-2017** | **14-CV-01278** | **(W.D. Pa.)** | **Jahoda, et al. v. Redbox Automated Retail, LLC**  United States Magistrate Judge Lisa Pupo Lenihan entered an Order which, inter alia, changed the date and time of the Fairness Hearing. | **10-20-2017** | **For more information write or e-mail:**  **Benjamin J. Sweet**  **Carlson Lynch Sweet &**  **Kilpela, LLP**  **1133 Penn Avenue**  **5th Floor**  **Pittsburgh, PA 15222**  [**www.carlsonlynch.com**](http://www.carlsonlynch.com) |
| **6-27-2016** | **15-CV-08954** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Enrico Vaccaro v. New Source Energy Partners L.P.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the federal securities laws because Defendants allegedly made false and misleading statements to the investing public as alleged in the Second Amended Complaint, regarding: (1) New Source’s relationship with its contract operator, (2) New Source’s credit facility, (3) New Source’s exposure to commodity prices, and (4) New Source’s restructuring plan. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Phillip Kim**  **THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.**  **275 Madison Avenue**  **34th Floor**  **New York, New York 10016** |
| **6-28-2017** | **12-MD-02311**  **14-CV-00507**  **14-CV-13356** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **In re: Truck and Equipment Dealer cases**  **Re Defendants: Nachi-Fujikoshi Corporation and Nachi America Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants’ unlawful conduct had the following effects: (1) Bearings price competition was restrained, suppressed, and eliminated throughout Arkansas; (2) Bearings prices were raised, fixed, maintained, and stabilized at artificially high levels throughout  Arkansas; (3) Plaintiffs and the members of the Damages Class were deprived of free and open competition; and (4) Plaintiffs and the members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Bearings and Vehicles containing Bearings. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **DUANE MORRIS LLP**  **Wayne A. Mack**  **J. Manly Parks**  **30 S. 17th Street**  **Philadelphia, PA 19103**  **215 979-1000 (Ph.)**  **215 979-1020 (Fax)**  [**wamack@duanemorris.com**](mailto:wamack@duanemorris.com)  [**jmparks@duanemorris.com**](mailto:jmparks@duanemorris.com) |
| **6-28-2017** | **15-CV-03773** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Errol Rudman, et al. v. CHC Group Ltd., et al.**  **Re Defendants: William J. Amelio, Joan S. Hopper, Rebecca Camden, William E. Macaulay, Jonathan Lewis and Kenneth W. Moore, and the underwriters of the 1-16-2014 initial public offering of the stock of CHC, namely, J.P. Morgan Securities LLC, Barclays Capital Inc., UBS Securities, LLC HSBC Securities (USA) Inc., RBC Capital Markets, LLC, Wells Fargo Securities, LLC, BNP Paribas Securities Corp., Standard Bank Plc. Cormark Securities (USA) Ltd., Cowen and Company, LLC, Raymond James & Associates, Inc. Simmons & Company, International (Piper Jaffray & Co., as successor in interest) and Tudo, Pickering, Holt & Co. Securities, Inc. (collectively, the “Defendants”)**  Plaintiffs allege that CHC’s Registration Statement was negligently prepared, contained omissions of material fact, and contained materially misleading statements. Plaintiffs further allege that the Registration Statement failed to disclose material facts concerning certain impact to CHC of the grounding of a particular type of helicopter, the Eurocopter EC225 for several months prior to the IPO, and the payment disputes related thereto with one of CHC’s largest customers, Petróleo Brasileiro S.A. (“Petrobras”). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Ira M. Press**  **Meghan J. Summers**  **Kirby McInerney LLP**  **825 Third Avenue**  **16th Floor**  **New York, NY 10022** |
| **6-29-2017** | **14-CV-00507**  **14-CV-13356** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **In re: Bearings Cases (Truck and Equipment Dealer Actions)**  **Re Defendants: NSK Ltd. And NSK Americas, Inc.**  The lawsuit claims that the Defendants agreed to unlawfully raise the price of certain motor vehicle Bearings. As a result, dealers of Trucks and/or Equipment who purchased for resale or lease Trucks and/or Equipment containing those parts or who indirectly purchased those parts as replacement parts, which were manufactured or sold by a Defendant or any subsidiary, affiliate, or alleged co-conspirator of a Defendant, are alleged to have paid more than they should have. | **9-13-2017** | **For more information call or visit:**  **1 866-742-4955 (Ph.)**  [**www.TruckDealerSettlement.com**](http://www.TruckDealerSettlement.com) |
| **6-30-2017** | **14-CV-00367** | **(D. Or.)** | **In re: Galena Biopharma, Inc., Securities**  **Re Defendants: DreamTeam Group LLC or MissionIR (“DreamTeam”), Michael McCarthy (“McCarthy”), Lidingo Holdings, LLC (“Lidingo”) and Kamilla Bjorlin (“Bjorlin”)**  Plaintiff alleges that, during the Class Period, Galena’s stock price was artificially inflated as a result of a series of articles and statements that were part of a “pump and dump” scheme. Beginning July 2013, Galena retained the Remaining Defendants to tout Galena’s stock. Plaintiffs further contend that Remaining Defendants’ articles artificially inflated the value of Galena stock, and that investors suffered injury as a result of the alleged inflation and subsequent disclosure thereof. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit, e-mail or call:**  [**www.galenasecuritieslitigation.com**](http://www.galenasecuritieslitigation.com)  [**info@galenasecuritieslitigation.com**](mailto:info@galenasecuritieslitigation.com)  **844 830-5235 (Ph.)** |
| **6-30-2017** | **12-MD-02311**  **13-CV-01403** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **In re: Ignition Coils**  **Re Defendants: Diamond Electric Mfg. Co., Ltd. and Diamond Electric Mfg. Corporation**  Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of Diamond Electric's participation in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for Ignition Coils, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act and various state antitrust, unfair completion, unjust enrichment, and consumer protection laws as set forth in End-Payor Plaintiffs’ Second Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint in the Ignition Coils Action. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Cotchett, Pitre, &**  **McCarthy LLP**  **San Francisco Airport**  **Office Center**  **840 Malcolm Road**  **Suite 200**  **Burlingame, CA 94010**  **Robins Kaplan LLP**  **399 Park Avenue**  **Suite 3600**  **New York, NY 10022** |
| **6-30-2017** | **12-MD-02311**  **13-CV-01202**  **13-CV-01702** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **In re: Automotive Lamps Cases**  **In re: HID Ballasts Cases**  **Re Defendant: Koito Manufacturing Co., Ltd. and North American Lighting, Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege conspiracy among some automotive industry’s largest manufacturers, marketers, and sellers of Automotive Parts, including Automotive Lamps and HID Ballasts, to fix the prices, rig bids, and allocate the market and customers in the United States for such products. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **BARRETT LAW GROUP, P.A.**  **P.O. Box 927**  **404 Court Square**  **Lexington, MS 39095**  **CUNEO GILBERT & LADUCA, LLP**  **4725 Wisconsin Avenue, NW**  **Suite 200**  **Washington, DC 20016** |
| **6-30-2017** | **15-MD-02617** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litigation**  The lawsuit was brought on behalf of the individuals impacted by the Data Breach against Anthem, its subsidiaries and affiliates, and certain Blue Cross and Blue Shield companies who had members with data stored on Anthem’s databases that was taken in the Data Breach, even though they were not Anthem members. The Plaintiffs claim that Defendants failed to adequately protect their personal information and that they were injured as a result. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**  [**www.settlementwebsite.com/page**](http://www.settlementwebsite.com/page) |
| **6-30-2017** | **14-CV-02392** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Genworth Financial, Inc. Securities Litigation**  The complaint alleged that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements to investors during the period from 11-3-2011 through 4-17-2012 in violation of §§10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder. The complaint also alleged that on 4-17-2012, after the market closed, Genworth announced that the planned second quarter 2012 minority initial public offering of its Australian mortgage insurance subsidiary would be delayed until at least “early 2013,” with the “new timeframe primarily reflecting recent business performance in Australia.” The next day, on 4-18-2012, Genworth’s stock price dropped. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN**  **& DOWD LLP**  **DOUGLAS BRITTON**  **655 West Broadway, Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |