

Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
 Received in March 2011 by the  
 Attorney General for the District of Columbia

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3/1/2011	08 CV 00467	(E.D. Pa.)	<p data-bbox="703 412 1213 435"><b>Allison et al v. GEO Group, Inc.</b></p> <p data-bbox="703 444 1470 857">Class consists of all persons who were placed into the custody of one or more JAILS after being detained for misdemeanors, summary offenses, or other crimes that did not involve the possession or distribution of drugs, possession of weapons, crimes of violence or felonies, who had no history of such charges, and did not behave in a manner at intake that would give intake officers reasonable suspicion that the inmate was carrying or concealing contraband, but were strip searched upon their admission into one or more of the jails pursuant to Defendants' then existing strip search policy.</p> <p data-bbox="703 894 1453 1068">(JAILS included the George W. Hill Correctional Facility in PA, Frio County Detention Center in TX, Newton County Correctional Center in TX, Dickens County Correctional Center in TX, Tri-County Detention Center in Ill, or Guadalupe County Detention Center in NM.)</p> <p data-bbox="703 1105 1470 1398">Class Members who submitted claims on the Settlement by 9-14-10 were entitled to receive a pro-rata share of the fund not to exceed \$400. Defendants are enjoined from conducting strip searches of pretrial detainees who are admitted to the Jails, in the absence of reasonable suspicion to justify a strip search. This injunction shall remain in effect for 18 months from the date of the Order granting Final Approval of the Settlement.</p>	10/1/10	<p data-bbox="1684 412 2005 467"><a href="http://www.multistatestripsearchsettlement.com">www.multistatestrips earchsettlement.com</a></p> <p data-bbox="1684 537 2005 592"><b>Claims Administrator</b> (877) 234-4512</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			Three Class Members were District residents.		
3/7/2011	10-CV-5484 10-CV-5948	(C.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Quantcast Advertising Cookie Litigation</b>  <b>Clearspring Flash Cookie Litigation</b>  Plaintiff alleged that Defendant's use of local shared objects stored in Adobe Flash Media local storage ("LSOs") regenerated certain information stored in internet users' HTTP browser "cookies" after users deleted those cookies. Plaintiffs allege that Quantcast and Clearspring used these methods on many web pages, including those operated by the other Defendants in this matter.</p> <p>Class Members reside in the US or its territories and if, at any time between 6-1-08 and 3-3-11, they used any web browsing program on any device to access any websites or online content controlled, operated or sponsored by the defendants or the Undertaking Parties, or any website employing any of Clearspring's or Quantcast's or Video Egg's technologies involving the use of HTTP (browser) cookies or Adobe Flash LSOs.</p> <p>Settlement will not make a payment to Class Members but instead creates a cy pres fund to pay charitable organizations involved in consumer education and approved by the court after administrative expenses, attorney fees, and incentive payments are made to named plaintiffs.</p>	Not set yet	Forms of Notice <a href="http://www.flashcookiesettlement.com">www.flashcookiesettlement.com</a>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3/7/2011	08-CV-11117	(S.D. N.Y.)	<p><b>Tremont Securities Law, State Law and Insurance Litigation.</b></p> <p>Plaintiffs allege, inter alia, that Tremont breached fiduciary and contractual duties by investing money with Madoff without conducting an adequate investigation of his operations. Plaintiffs further allege that defendants misrepresented or failed to disclose material information regarding Tremont's investigation of Madoff.</p> <p>Class Members are (a) all persons other than the Settling Defendants who were holders of limited partnership interest/shares (LPI/S) of Rye Funds or Tremont Funds (TFs) as of 12-11-08, who sustained net losses; (b) all persons who purchased LPI/S of Rye Funds (RF)(other than Rye Select Broad Market Insurance Portfolio LDC)or TFs between 5-10-94 through and including 12-11-08 ("Securities Subclass"); and (c) or holder of LPI/S in any of the Settling Funds ("Fund Claimants") are entitled to a payment (a "Fund Distribution") from the Remaining Fund Proceeds (the "Fund Distribution Account," respectively).</p> <p>The Settlement provides for a cash payment to Class Members of up to \$150 million in the aggregate and the release of the settled claims against the Settling Defendants.</p> <p>Four Class Members reside in Washington, DC.</p>	Not set yet	<a href="http://www.nysd.uscourts.gov/ecf.php">Http://www.nysd.uscourts.gov/ecf.php</a>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3/7/11	08-CV-288	(E.D. Va.)	<p><b>Cappetta v. G.C. Services, L.P.,</b> Plaintiff alleged that GC Services used the consumer reports of Class Members to collect American Express credit card debts that were actually owed only by the primary obligors on the account. The use of class member consumer reports violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act because they were not used for a permissible purpose under 15 U.S.C. § 1681b of the law. Plaintiffs sought both statutory and punitive damages, in addition to injunctive and declaratory relief.</p> <p>Class Members: You are a member of the Settlement Class and are affected by the settlement if you; were not listed as a basic (primary) cardmember on any account assigned by American Express to GC Services, LP for collection; and regarding whom GC Services, LP obtained an Experian Full Address Update consumer report from 5-9-06 to 3-18-09; or regarding whom GC Services, LP obtained a full Experian credit report from 9-23-07 to 1-1-09.</p> <p>If you meet this description, unless your valid request for exclusion is received by the Claim Administrator by 3-15-11, you are automatically a member of the Settlement Class (a "Class Member") and are automatically included in the settlement and entitled to a monetary benefit if you submit a claim form ("Claim Form").</p> <p>Settlement: There is a common fund of \$3,000,000 to pay all Class Member claims and the</p>	4-26-2011	<a href="http://www.gcservicesclassaction.com">www.gcservicesclassaction.com</a>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>administrative costs in the case. Claim would be paid as follows; if 15% of Class Members submit claims, the parties estimate that you would receive approximately \$253.33; 10% \$380.00 and 2% \$599.00. If all Class Members submits claims, they would receive \$38.00.</p> <p>In order to participate in the settlement, you must certify that you were not the primary obligor on an American Express account during the class period.</p> <p>Claim form must be post-marked no later 3-15-11</p>		
3/9/2011	09 CV 02079	(C.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Hunter v. Citibank</b> Plaintiff asserts claims of conversion, breach of fiduciary duty, aiding and abetting a fraud, and negligent supervision of the Atlantic Exchange Company for loss of Class Members deposits in Internal Revenue code Section 1031 exchanges. This class action charges Exchange Entities with failure to complete Internal Revenue Code Section 1031 exchange transactions. Class includes all persons who were customers of 1031 Advance 132 LLC, 1031 Advance, Inc., 1031 TG Oak Harbor, LLC, AEC Exchange Company, LLC, Atlantic Exchange Company, Inc., Atlantic Exchange Co. LLC, Investment Exchange Group, LLC, National Exchange Accommodations, LLC, National Exchange Services QI, Ltd, NRC 1031 LLC, Real Estate Exchange Services Inc., Rutherford Investment, LLC, Security 1031 Services LLC, Shamrock Holdings Group LLC, and or the 1031 Tax Group, LLC including any</p>	6/27/2011	<p><b>More info:</b> <b>Plaintiff's Attorney</b> <b>Hollister &amp; Brace PC</b> <a href="http://www.hbsb.com">www.hbsb.com</a> <b>(805) 963-6711</b></p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>subsidiaries or affiliates of any of those entities engaged in business as Qualified Intermediaries pursuant to 26 U.S.C. § 1031. One District resident is a known class member. There are three settlement classes ("Waves") proposed in this action. Due to the complex nature of each settlement wave and the need to submit timely claims for potential recovery of losses, all Class Members should contact Plaintiff's attorneys at Hollister &amp; Brace to determine under which wave their claim might be adjudicated.</p>		
3/9/2011	09-CV-5547		<p><b>Ann Gregg, et al. v. the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania</b>  The Class Representatives alleged on behalf of a purported class of Penn employees who are scheduled to receive an unpaid, thirty minute meal break that they and the members of the purported class were not paid their regular or statutorily required rate of pay for all hours worked and were not paid at time and one-half for hours they worked over 40 in a week because they regularly worked through their meal break period or had their meal break period interrupted because of work responsibilities. On the basis of these allegations, the Class Representatives demanded damages including unpaid compensation, interest and penalties. Class Members are all current and former employees of the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania (UPa.) or a related entity ("Penn") who were employed in the UPa Health System as a non-exempt employee paid on an hourly basis who was scheduled to receive an unpaid 30 minute</p>	6-6-2011	<p>The full settlement agreement is also available with the United States District Court for the E.D. of Pennsylvania's Clerk's Office at 601 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106.</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>meal break, other than: 1) registered nurses who are or were employed at the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania ("HUP") for the time period that they were employed at HUP in a registered nursing position; and 2) individuals who submitted forms to opt-into the Action but for whom Penn has no record of being or having been employed by Penn; 3) non-exempt employees coded as "no meal deduct" in Penn eSTAR system; 4) Clinical Care Associates who work in Pennsylvania or New Jersey; 5) nonexempt employees at HUP or Penn's corporate entities before July 13, 2008, which is the date of implementation of eSTAR, unless the employee was subject to either the One Staff or Jantek system from November 20, 2006 to July 13, 2008; and 6) non-exempt employees at Pennsylvania Hospital before May 31, 2009, which is the date of implementation of eSTAR, unless the employee was subject to the One Staff system from November 20, 2006 to May 31, 2009.</p> <p>Settlement: Class Member Distribution Amount (your "Settlement Share") depends on a number of factors, including relative merits of your individual claim, length of service during the relevant period, timeliness of your claim, and other considerations. The minimum Settlement Share payment for each Class Member is \$100.00. The Settlement Share payments will be reduced by applicable tax deductions and withholdings for part of your payment.</p> <p>There are approximately 2 DC residents included in the settlement class.</p>		

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3/10/2011	07-CV-05107	(C.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Korean Air Lines Co., Ltd. Antitrust Lit.</b> Plaintiff alleges that the airlines conspired, in violation of the federal antitrust laws, to fix the prices for air passenger travel between the U.S. and the Republic of Korea from January 1, 2000 through August 1, 2007. The lawsuit claims the conspiracy included meetings, conversations, and communications in the U.S. and elsewhere between the two Defendants during which they agreed to establish artificially high prices for air passenger travel.</p> <p>Class Members bought at least one ticket for air passenger travel on Asiana Airlines or Korean Air Lines. The purchase must have been:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Made in the United States; and</li> <li>2) For a flight originating in the United States and ending in Korea or a flight originating in Korea and ending in the United States; and</li> <li>3) Made between January 1, 2000 and August 1, 2007 (the "Class Period").</li> </ol> <p>Both businesses (including travel agents) and individuals may be Class Members.</p> <p>Settlement provides that in exchange for the release of claims, Asiana will pay a total of \$21,000,000 for the benefit of the Class. Asiana is providing \$11,000,000 in cash and \$10,000,000 in travel vouchers. The cash, net of attorneys' fees and expenses allowed by the Court, and vouchers will be made available to Class Members</p>	Not set yet	



**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			at the conclusion of this lawsuit against <i>all</i> Defendants. The cash and vouchers will be distributed <i>pro rata</i> , based on total qualifying purchases in dollars, to Class Members who submit claims on a timely basis.		
3/11/2011	06-CV-1775	(E.D. N.Y.)	<p><b>Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation.</b> Plaintiff alleges that Defendant and Co-Conspirator orchestrated single, unitary, global and overarching conspiracy to fix, raise, maintain, or stabilize prices of Airfreight Shipping Services through a number of mechanisms, including, inter alia, concertedly levying inflated Surcharges, jointly agreeing to eliminate or prevent discounting of Airfreight shipping Services prices, agreeing on rates and Yields, and allocating customers.</p> <p>Class Member: All persons or entities that purchased Airfreight Shipping Services for shipments to, from, or within the United States directly from any of the Settling Defendants, during the period 1-1-00 up to and including 9-11-06.</p> <p>Settlement: Under the Plan of Allocation, the settlement funds will first be used to pay attorneys' fees approved by the court. The remaining amount will be distributed to class members that submit valid claims forms in proportion to their relevant purchases of Airfreight Shipping Services. For purposes of this calculation, purchase amounts in currencies</p>	6/24/2011	<p>For more information</p> <p>Air Cargo Settlement 2 c/o The Garden City Group, Inc. P.O. Box 9380 Dublin, OH 43017-4280 USA</p> <p>To view settlement documents</p> <p><a href="http://www.aircargosettlement2.com">www.aircargosettlement2.com</a></p> <p>Contact Information</p> <p>1-888-291-9655</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			other than dollars will be converted by the settlement administrator to equivalent dollar amounts using currency exchange rates applicable on 9-11-06, which is the last day of the class period.		
3/11/2011	06-CV-0643	(S.D. N.Y.)	<p><b>In re Refco Capital Markets, Ltd. Brokerage Customer Securities Litigation</b> Plaintiff alleges that this action arises out of a scheme to steal assets belonging to customers of RCM in order to cover up billions of dollars of fraudulently undisclosed losses incurred by Refco. Plaintiff alleges Refco engaged in a practice of surreptitiously selling securities being held by RCM in custody for Plaintiffs and the class with the undisclosed intent to misappropriate the proceeds.</p> <p>Class members are all brokerage customers of Refco Capital Markets, Ltd. ("RCM") who, at any time from 10-17-2000 to 10-17-2005, entrusted securities to RCM and/or Refco Securities, LLC, directly or indirectly, as custodian and broker from safe-keeping, and continued to hold positions with RCM on 10-17-2005 (the "Class Period") or thereafter.</p> <p>Settlement: Based on the formulas for allocating distributions between Settlement Class Members and the other beneficiaries of the Refco Litigation Trust and the Refco Private Actions Trust (i.e., certain other unsecured creditors of Refco), the amount to be distributed to the Settlement Class, in the aggregate, will be</p>	Not set yet	contact Refco Estate at (201) 587-7195 or e-mail your questions to refcoinc@capstoneag.com.

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>approximately \$40 million. Each Settlement Class Member, as a beneficiary of both the Refco Litigation Trust and the Refco Private Actions Trust, will be entitled to receive its pro-rata share of the distribution in accordance with its interests in the Trusts (see web site link).</p>		
3-14-2011	07-CV-03508	(E.D.Penn.)	<p><b>Alston et al. v. Countrywide Fin. Corp., et al.</b> Plaintiff alleges that Countrywide provided misleading information to conceal its unlawful kickback scheme. Plaintiff alleged defendant paid kickbacks to Balboa and represented such payments were for services performed instead of correctly stating them as referral fees.</p> <p>Class Member are all borrowers with residential mortgage loans closed on or after December 22, 2005 through December 31, 2008 that were reinsured by CW Reinsurance Company F/K/A Balboa Reinsurance Company or its subsidiaries, excluding borrowers with residential mortgage loans originated by Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.'s correspondence lending division or otherwise purchased on the secondary market.</p> <p>Settlement agreement will provide up to a total of \$34,000,000 to establish a Settlement Fund. Subject to and in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement, the Settlement Administrator or Defendants shall provide to each Participating Class Member their distribution of the Net Settlement Amount ("Settlement Payment"). Each Participating Class Members' Settlement Payment shall be determined</p>	Not set yet	

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			pursuant to a formula developed by Lead Class Counsel based on an analysis of the number of private mortgage insurance ("PMI") payments made by each Participating Class Member as of the Preliminary Approval Date. The Settlement Payment with respect to any Class Member shall be provided by check. For the purposes of developing the allocation formula, Defendants shall provide to Lead Class Counsel and the Settlement Administrator relevant information needed to calculate the Settlement Payment. Only one check will be issued per reinsured loan, regardless of the number of co-signers on the loan.		
3/14/2011	09-CV-6178	(N.D. Ill.)	<p><b>Tasha Joshaway, et al. v. First Student Inc.,</b> Plaintiff alleged damages and other relief brought by plaintiffs on behalf of all persons whose rights under the Fair Credit Reporting Act were violated by Defendant, First Student, Inc. ("First Student"), on or after October 5, 2007, when First Student terminated their employment or denied them employment in reliance on information contained in "consumer reports" without first providing them with: (a) a pre-adverse action disclosure which includes a copy of the employee's consumer report obtained from the consumer reporting agency and a description in writing of the employee's rights under the FCRA; and (b) a pre-adverse action opportunity to dispute the accuracy of the reported information.</p> <p>Class Member are; if between October 5, 2007 and August 10, 2010, Defendants: (1) procured a</p>	Not set yet	

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>consumer report about the individual without making the disclosure required (2) procured a consumer report about the individual without the individual's written authorization; or (3) took adverse action against the individual based in whole or in part on a consumer report without first providing the individual a copy of his or her consumer report and the FTC's Summary FCRA Rights. Subclass if an individual only falls under (1) and (2) only.</p> <p>Settlement: The \$5.9 million will be placed in an interest bearing account titled in the name of First Group FCRA Settlement fund, a Qualified Settlement fund organized and existing under the laws of Florida. The \$5.9 million so transferred, together with interest subsequently earned thereon, will constitute the total settlement case outlay by Defendants in connection with this settlement: (a) all amounts paid to Class Members, including the Named Plaintiffs; (b) all attorney's fees and costs awarded by the court, other than fees and costs awarded in connection with any successful proceeding to enforce the terms of this Settlement Agreement; and (c) all cost incurred by the Settlement Administrator in connection with the Settlement Fund including, but not limited to those related to notice, claims processing, and legal advice relating to the establishment of the Qualified Settlement Fund.</p>		

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3/16/2011	08-CV-04263	(S.C. Cal.)	<p><b>Tom Lambotte, individually v. Ticketmaster d/b/a Cityserch</b>  Plaintiff brings this action for damages and injunctive relief against defendants IAC/InterActiveCorp, Ticketmaster, doing business as Citysearch and Citysearch.com demanding a trial by jury, to recover damages and other relief available at law and in equity on behalf of himself and members of the class.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities in the United States who paid money for pay-per-click advertising through Citysearch.com; (2) Citysearch charges its customers for an advertising service which in fact it does not provide.</p> <p>Settlement: Class Members will be sent a claim form to be completed and returned to the claims Administrator. Class Members who submit such claims will generally be entitled to receive a credit to their account of 1% of the amounts they have paid to Citysearch for PPC ads during the Class Period. Class Members who have not had an open account with Citysearch for at least two years will be entitled to a refund rather than a credit. If based on particular circumstances, Citysearch believes that this credit (or refund) is not due to a particular Class Member; it may deny or reduce the amount of the claim. Any such decision by Citysearch will be subject to review by a neutral retired judge if the Class Member appeals.</p>	6/13/2011	

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

<b>Preliminary Notice Date</b>	<b>Case Number</b>	<b>Court</b>	<b>Case Name Summary of Issue</b>	<b>Fairness Hearing Date</b>	<b>Website Link</b>
			District of Columbia has 49 Class Members.		
3/17/2011	08-CV-2995 08-CV-3183	(D. S.C.)	<p><b>Robert A. Latham, et al. v. Bill Mathews et al Darryl K. Roth, et al. v. Bill Mathews et al</b> Plaintiff allege that Defendants made false or materially misleading statements to the investing public that the Company had no means of manufacturing or marketing the Fidelity 100 in the foreseeable future; that the product had performed poorly in objective trails; that there were no actual orders for the heart monitoring products; and that the Company's marketing partners were unable to sell Signalife's heart monitor because Signalife could not produce a salable product.</p> <p>Class is comprised of all persons who purchased the publicly traded common stock of Signalife, Inc., between February 10, 2004 and April 14, 2008, inclusive, and who claim damages as alleged in the action. A person whose common stock is held by a broker as nominee will not be excluded on that basis.</p> <p>Settlement: The Parties have agreed to a four million dollar (\$4,000.00) settlement as full consideration for this action against Defendants Signalife, Bures, Harrison, Pickard, Scherne, Drakulic, Matthew and Stein.</p>	Not set yet	<p>Signalife Securities Litigation: c/o The Garden City Group, Inc. P.O. Box 9698 Dublin, Ohio 43017 (888) 885-9698</p> <p>Claim Form: <a href="http://www.signalifeselement.com">www.signalifeselement.com</a>.</p>
3/17/2011	09-CV-81470	(W. P.B.)	<b>Eric Springer and Maurice J. Seghers, Jr. on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated v. Tigrent Inc. aka Whitney Information</b>	8/5/2011	Register Unique Password <a href="http://www.TMTTsettl">http://www.TMTTsettl</a>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p><b>Network, Inc.</b> Plaintiff allege that Defendants engaged in fraud, negligent misrepresentation, civil conspiracy, and violations of the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act in connection with the marketing and sale of TMTT seminars, products regarding the trading expertise, experience, and qualification of TMTT instructors and mentors, the simplicity and effectiveness of the TMTT system, and the success enjoyed by previous TMTT purchasers.</p> <p>Class includes all persons who paid to attend a TMTT seminar or purchased a TMTT product or service, and who have not subsequently received a full refund of the money spent on such seminar, product, or service, including any and all of their respective successors in interest, predecessors, representatives, trustee, executor, administrators, heirs, assigns, and any person or entity acting for or on behalf of them.</p> <p>Settlement provides for access to the Investment Seminars at no charge by the Tigaret Defendants for a period of ninety (90) days following final court approval of the Settlement. The Settlement contemplates that the Investment Seminars will be placed on a website to which Class Members will be provided access, using password to view any or all of the Investment Seminars at your option.</p>		<p>ement.com</p>



Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
 Received in March 2011 by the  
 Attorney General for the District of Columbia

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3/18/2011	09-MD-2096	(D. Ariz.)	<p><b>In re Zicam Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation</b>  <b>Update:</b>            Plaintiff alleges Defendant misrepresented the <b>safety</b> of Zicam Cold Remedy Nasal Gel Spray, Zicam Cold Remedy Gel Swabs (Kid's size) in not disclosing the possible loss of sense or smell with the use of these cold remedy products.</p> <p>Class Members include all persons in the U.S. who purchased Zicam Cold Remedy Nasal Gel Spray, Zicam Cold Remedy Gel Swabs &amp; Zicam Cold Remedy Gel Swabs (Kids size) from 1-1-99- 10-19-10.</p> <p>Settlement provides injunctive relief requiring Defendant to include the specific adverse effects required by the FDA on the products labels if Defendant reintroduces these cold remedies to the market in the U.S. and requires Defendant to provide the Co-Lead Counsel with 30 days advance notice of any proposed wording to the label on these cold remedies if reintroduced.</p>	5/27/11	<p>Plaintiff Counsel:            Andrew Friedman            Bonnett, Fairbourn,            Friedman and Balint            P.C.            2901 N. Central            Avenue Suite 1000            Phoenix, AZ 85102            (602) 274-1100</p>
3/10/2011 and 3/18/2011	07-CV-1819	(N.D. Cal.)	<p><b>SRAM Antitrust Litigation</b>            Plaintiff alleges an over-arching horizontal conspiracy among Defendants to fix prices and reduce production for SRAM and to allocate markets and customers for the sale of SRAM in the United States from November 1, 1996 through December 31, 2005 (the "Class Period"). The claims against Defendants are that Plaintiff and members of the direct purchaser class (the</p>	Not set yet	<p>Information re:            settlement:  <a href="http://www.sramcase.com">www.sramcase.com</a></p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>"Class") were injured because they paid more for SRAM than they would have absent Defendants' illegal conspiracy. Plaintiff seeks, on behalf of itself and the Class, injunctive relief and treble damages.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities, During the period November 1, 1996 through December 31, 2005, purchase SRAM in the United States directly from Defendants or any subsidiaries or affiliates thereof. Excluded from the Class are defendants, their parent companies, subsidiaries and affiliates, any co-conspirators, and all government entities.</p> <p>Settlement 1: Cypress has agreed to pay \$6,250,000.00 ("Settlement Payment") to the Class in exchange for a dismissal with prejudice and a release of all claims asserted in the complaint Cypress will make the complaint. Cypress will make the Settlement Payment in an interest-bearing escrow account within 15 business days of this Court granting preliminary approval of the Settlement.</p> <p>Settlement 2: Samsung has agreed to pay \$32,250,000.00 ("Settlement Payment") to the Class in exchange for a dismissal with prejudice and a release of all claims asserted in the complaint. Samsung will make the Settlement Payment to an interest-bearing escrow account within 15 business days of this Court granting preliminary approval of the Settlement.</p>		

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3/18/2011	08-CV-810	(C.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Stetson, et al. v. West Publishing Corporation</b> Plaintiff filed this complaint for two purposes; (1) to break up the illegally obtained and maintained monopoly of BAR/BRI (an assumed name of Defendant West Publishing Corporation) in the market for the provision of bar review preparation courses for the nation's various bar exams, and to otherwise restore viable and enduring competition in the market for the benefit of consumer Class Members and (2) to recover the excess prices paid by many such Class Members for a BAR/BRI course as a consequence of said monopoly. Plaintiff alleges BAR/BRI has monopolized the bar review course market through means other than skill, industry foresight or historical accident. Plaintiff alleges Defendant have committed literally a catalogue of antitrust violations over the years in order to create and maintain said monopoly, including market division, unlawful acquisition, and conspiracies to restrain trade.</p> <p>Class Members are (A) individuals who have heretofore paid for a BAR/BRI course since July 1, 2006 or will do so prior to the time any injunctive relief obtained herein is fully implemented; and (B) law students who have not yet paid in full for a BAR/BRI course, but will be purchasing such courses when they graduate from law school as soon as 2008.</p> <p>Settlement provides Class Members with a discount certificate for a \$200.00 credit redeemable toward the future purchase of one</p>	Not set yet	For more information <a href="https://ecf.cacd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/ShowIndex.pl">https://ecf.cacd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/ShowIndex.pl</a>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Kaplan Course that would otherwise cost \$1,999.00 or more, OR a \$150.00 credit redeemable for the future purchase of one Kaplan Course that would otherwise cost \$1,499.00 up to \$1,098.00, OR a \$100.00 credit redeemable towards the purchase of a Kaplan Course that would otherwise cost \$999.00 to \$1,498.00, OR a \$50.00 credit towards the purchase of a Kaplan Course that would otherwise cost \$499.00 to \$998.00.</p> <p>Each discount certificate is valid and redeemable for a period of 30 months following the effective date of your suit.</p> <p>Approximately 4,650 District residents are members of the Settlement Class in this action.</p>		
3/22/2011	09-CV-00242	(E.D. Pa.)	<p><b>McDonough v. Toys R Us, Inc, Babies R Us, et al. Elliott v. Toys R Us, Inc, Babies R Us. et al.</b> Plaintiffs in these two cases allege Defendants entered into agreements in which Babies R Us agreed to carry certain Manufacturer's products only if the Manufacturers entered into agreements with other retailers requiring the retailers to maintain minimum resale prices of Manufacturer's products. Plaintiffs allege Babies R Us has monopoly power in the market for retail sales of "high end" baby products, such as those produced by the Manufacturers. Plaintiffs assert that due to Defendants' unlawful actions consumers were overcharged for baby product purchases. Subclasses were established as follows for the estimated 5</p>	7-6-2011	<p><a href="http://www.babyproductsanti-trustsettlement.com">www.babyproductsanti-trustsettlement.com</a></p> <p>(888)292-8492 phone (888)476-7153 Fax</p> <p>Claims Administrator The Garden City Group PO Box 9679 Dublin, Ohio 43017-4979 Email for info: questions@babyproductsettlement.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>million Class Members affected in this matter, as follows:</p> <p>Baby Bjorn subclass is composed of all persons who directly purchased any BabyBjorn baby carrier distributed by Regal Lager from Babies R Us within the US during the period February 2, 2000 to April 30, 2005.</p> <p>Britax car seat subclass is composed of all persons who directly purchased any Britax car seat from Babies R Us within the US during the period January 1, 1999 to the date of the Preliminary Approval Order.</p> <p>Kids Line subclass is composed of all persons who directly purchased any Kids Line product from Babies R Us within the US during the period January 1, 1999 to December 31, 2006.</p> <p>Maclaren stroller subclass is composed of all persons who directly purchased any Maclaren stroller from Babies R Us within the US during the period October 1, 1999 to the date of the Preliminary Approval order.</p> <p>Medela Pump subclass is composed of all persons who directly purchased any Medela Pump In Style breast pump from Babies R Us within the US during the period July 1, 1999 to the date of the Preliminary Approval Order.</p> <p>Peg Perego stroller subclass is composed of all persons who directly purchased any Peg Perego stroller from Babies R Us within the US during</p>		

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>the period July 1, 1999 to the date of the Preliminary Approval Order.</p> <p>Peg Perego high chair subclass is composed of all persons who directly purchased any Peg Perego high chair from Babies R Us within the US during the period July 1, 1999 to the date of the Preliminary Approval Order.</p> <p>Peg Perego car seat subclass is composed of all persons who directly purchased any Peg Perego car seat from Babies R us within the US during the period July 1, 1999 to the date of the Preliminary Approval Order.</p> <p>Claimants who file a proper validly sworn and timely claim that the Claims Administrator determines is valid for proof of purchase are eligible to receive a payment from each subclasses settlement fund in the amount of 20% of their actual purchase price of each settlement product or \$5.00, whichever is greater. Claims must be postmarked, faxed or submitted online by 8/1/2011.</p>		
3/24/2011	09-CV-01752	(D.C. D.C.)	<p><b>Carter et al. v. Wells Fargo Advisors LLC</b>  <b>Defendants filed a supplement to update the estimate of residents in the district affected by the action. Twelve District residents are putative Class Members per this update.</b>            Plaintiffs alleges Defendants engaged in systemic gender discrimination against female financial advisors in regard to compensation, account assignments, partnerships, promotional</p>	6/8/2011	<a href="http://www.wachoviagentderdiscrimination.com">www.wachoviagentderdiscrimination.com</a> <a href="mailto:info@findjustice.com">info@findjustice.com</a>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>opportunity, training and development in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.</p> <p>Class Members include all 1) Women in US who are/were employed as Financial advisors by; a) Wachovia Securities LLC or its successor Wells Fargo Advisors LLC between 3-17-03 and the date of preliminary approval (pending) &amp;/or; b) Wells Fargo Investments LLC between 12-31-08 and the date of preliminary approval (pending); 2) Women employed as Financial Advisors by Prudential Securities Inc., or A.B. Edwards &amp; Sons, Inc., are included as of the effective date of respective consolidation/merger with Wachovia Securities/Wachovia Corp.</p> <p>Settlement provides for various forms of programmatic relief related to interviewing, hiring, training and development of Financial Advisors and mandates workforce diversity and inclusive efforts to be an active component in managerial evaluations. A monitor shall be appointed to monitor the company's efforts satisfy obligations of the settlement agreement.</p> <p>Settlement payments to be made on claims based on length of tenure, facts supported on the discrimination complaint, extent of claim released and contribution to prosecution of this action.</p>		
3/25/2011	09-CV-230	(D. Vt.)	<p><b>Allen et al. v. Dairy Farmers of America, Inc. et al.</b> Plaintiff alleges that Dean, DFA and DMS</p>	Not set yet	For more information Call: <a href="http://www.NEDairySettlement">www.NEDairySettlement</a>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>violated federal antitrust law and that as a result the prices paid to dairy farmers in Order 1 for raw Grade A milk were lower than they otherwise would have been. Order 1 includes Connecticut, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Delaware and parts of New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia.</p> <p>Class Members are all dairy farmers, whether individuals, entities or members of cooperatives, who produce Grade A milk within Order 1 during any time from January 1, 2002 to the present, are members of the Dean Settlement Class. Defendants and Defendant's Co-conspirators are excluded from the Class.</p> <p>Settlement Agreement with Dean provides that Dean will pay \$30,000,000 for the benefit of the Settlement Class. This amount will be disposed in the Escrow Account by Dean within 15 calendar days after entry of the preliminary approval order. The Settlement Agreement allows Dean to reduce the settlement Amount based on the percentage of the Settlement Class that elects to opt out from the Settlement Agreement, the reduction would be calculated based on the percentage of opt outs' raw Grade A milk sales in Order 1 relative to total sales by the Settlement Class in Order 1.</p>		.com
3/25/2011	09-CV-14591	(D. Mass.)	<p><b>Milford &amp; Ford Associates, Inc. and D. Michael Collins v. Cell-Tek, L.L.C, et al.</b> Plaintiff allege that Cell-Tek or it agents have</p>	Not set yet	Claim Forms: Administrator



**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>custody and control of the business records and other information necessary to identify the members of the class including names and telephone facsimile numbers.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities within the United States to whom Cell-Tek in or about November of 2007, sent, or caused to be sent, facsimile advertisements identical in substance to the Cell-Tek Junk Fax attached to the Class Complaint.</p> <p>Settlement fund is \$1,800,000. Class Member who submits a timely and valid Claim Form will be entitled to an equal payment from the Settlement fund. The amount of payment will depend on how many Settlement Class Members return Claim forms. The maximum amount is \$500 per claim.</p>		<p>c/o A.B. Data, LTD P.O. Box 170500 Milwaukee, WI 53217</p>
3/28/2011	07-CV-1640	(D. Conn.)	<p><b>Tedesco v. Bank of American Corp and Bank of America Plan for Legacy Fleet</b></p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that the notice provided in connection with the restatement was inadequate under the employee retirement Income Security Act of 1974, that the cash balance formula violated provisions of ERISA prohibiting age discrimination, that summary Plan descriptions were inadequate, that the relative values of pension benefits paid as lump sums rather than as annuities were not adequately explained, and that the Plan and its fiduciaries violated ERISA in connection with the calculation and payment of benefits.</p>	6/2/2011	<p>For more information</p> <p><b>Thomas G. Moukawsher Moukawsher &amp; Walsh 328 Mitchell Street Groton, CT 06340 (860) 445-1809 tmoukawsher@mwlawgroup.com</b></p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Class Member includes any and all persons with a vested benefit who are former or current participants assigned hypothetical cash balance account under the Fleet Boston Financial Pension Plan (FBFPP) who were also participants in the BankBoston Cash Balance (BBCB) retirement Plan on 12-31-96 and 1-1-97. To be within the Class definition, putative class member must: 1) have earned a vested benefit; 2) have participated in the BBCB Retirement Plan on the above dates; and 3) have been employed by FBFC on or after 1-1-97. In addition, the Class includes any person who is Beneficiary of a person satisfying the above criteria and, as Beneficiary, has a current legal entitlement to receive some or all of the participant's benefits.</p> <p>Settlement Amounts to Class Member is \$16,990,000. Settlement amount to Class Members will be allocated based on two factors: 1) whether a class Member had a Prior Annuity Benefit that was converted to a cash balance benefit in connection with the 1997 Cash Balance Restatement, and 2) Class Member's years of service as of 1-1-10. Class Members grouped into six Service Groups based on years of services as of 1-1-10. Service Group with more years of services will received larger Settlement Amount than those who do not have a Prior Annuity Benefit.</p>		
3/28/2011	09-CV-04421	(C.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Angela Minor v. RealPage, Inc.</b> Plaintiff allege that RealPage failed to clearly and accurately disclose to Plaintiff and to all</p>	6-2-2011	For more information <a href="http://www.realpagesettlement.com">www.realpagesettlement.com</a>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Class Members all information required in response to their requests including but not limited to; 1) all information contained in RealPage's file concerning the Class Members; 2) the sources of the information including the identity of the public record vendor that provided the information to RealPage; and 3) the "summary of rights" mandated by Congress.</p> <p>Class Members were provided a letter from RealPage substantially similar to the letter (to get a copy please see for more information) within a two year period preceding the filing date of the Complaint.</p> <p>Settlement Agreement: RealPage will pay \$400,000 to a common fund, from which attorney's fees, costs and the incentive award to the Class representatives, will be deducted, after which the remaining funds will be distributed to the Class Members on an equal basis. Class Counsel estimates this will be approximately \$149 to each class member based on the fact that there are 1,874 Class Members. Any funds not distributed within eight months after the effective date shall be distributed as a cy pres award to be approved by the court.</p>		<p><b>Mitchell A. Toups Weller, Green, Toups &amp; Terrell, L.L.P. P.O. Box 350 Beaumont, Texas 77704</b></p>
3/28/2011	08 CV 4546	(D. Minn.)	<p><b>Figas et al. v. Wells Fargo &amp; Company</b> Plaintiffs allege Defendants breached their fiduciary duties under the ERISA by allowing the Wells Fargo &amp; Company 401(k) Plan to continue to invest in certain investment funds offered and managed by Wells Fargo affiliates and</p>	Not yet set	<p><a href="http://www.sf401ksettlement.com">www.sf401ksettlement.com</a> (to be set up)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
Received in March 2011 by the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>subsidiaries, when better nonaffiliated funds were available.</p> <p>Class Members include individuals who were participants in the Wells Fargo &amp; Company 401(k) Plan whose plan accounts had a balance in any of the following funds from 11-2-2001 to 10-8-2009: Wells Fargo Diversified Small Cap Fund; Wells Fargo Diversified Equity Fund; Wells Fargo Large Company Growth Fund; Wells Fargo Growth Balanced Fund; Wells Fargo Moderate Balanced Fund; Wells Fargo Aggressive Allocation Fund (formerly Wells Fargo Strategic Growth Allocation Fund); Wells Fargo Conservative Allocation Fund (formerly Wells Fargo Strategic Income Fund); Wells Fargo Asset Allocation Collective Trust; and Wells Fargo Capital Growth Fund.</p> <p>Settlement: Class Members share of the settlement fund (net expenses) will depend on the amount invested in the various Wells Funds as compared to other Settlement Class Members investments. Each settlement class member's share of fund proceeds will be calculated in accordance with a court approved plan. If you are a Plan participant with a current account balance you do NOT have to file a claim to receive payment as the share proceeds will be deposited into your account. If you formerly had but do not currently have an account under the Plan you need to file a claim to receive a payment. (Claim Filing Deadline is not yet set and Fairness Hearing Date is not yet set) Approximately 85 District residents are Class Members in this action.</p>		

Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
 Received in March 2011 by the  
 Attorney General for the District of Columbia

Preliminary Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3/31/2011	09 CV 01109	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>Cyrus Ahmad Ebrahimi v. West Asset Mgmt., Inc. Plaintiff alleges Defendant violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act by improperly charging and collecting a \$12.50 "convenience fee" from the plaintiff to make a payment by telephone on a debt.</p> <p>Two subclasses were formed in this settlement:            A) California class consists of all natural persons who incurred an alleged debt for personal, family, or household purposes; whose alleged debt was referred to West for collection, and who, while residing in California between 9-25-05 and 3-31-10, paid a convenience fee to West; B) National class consists of all natural persons who incurred an alleged debt for personal, family, or household purposes; whose alleged debt was referred to West for collecting, and who, while residing anywhere in the U.S. except California between 9-25-05 and 3-31-10 paid a convenience fee to West. Settlement provides for all Class Members who submit a timely claim to be eligible to receive a settlement payment up to \$10.00.</p>	Not yet set	<p>Realtor's Counsel:  <b>James F. Clapp, Esq.</b>  <a href="mailto:jclapp@sdlaw.com">jclapp@sdlaw.com</a></p> <p><b>Marita M. Lauinger Esq</b>  <a href="mailto:mlauinger@sdlaw.com">Mlauinger@sdlaw.com</a>  <b>Dostart Clapp &amp; Coveney LLP</b>            (858) 623-4200 Tel.            (858) 623-4299 Fax</p>