| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court       | Case Name   | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link  |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---|---------------------|---|
|                |             |             | Summary of Issue  | Date                |   |
| 3-1-2013       | 11-CV-5026  | (S.D.N.Y.)  | City of Pontiac General Employees' Retirement<br>System v. Lockheed Martin Corp., et al.<br>Plaintiffs allege that Lockheed Martin<br>Corporation made material misleading statements<br>or omissions on financial statements to<br>artificially inflate the price of its common<br>stock in violation of the security and exchange<br>act.<br>Class Members are all person who purchased<br>Lockheed Martin stock from 4-21-2009 to 7-21-<br>2009 and were damaged thereby.  | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>write to:<br>Settlement Administration<br>Gilardi & Company LLC<br>P.O. Box 990<br>Corte Madera, CA 94976 |
| 3-1-2013       | 06-CV-0963  | (N.D. Cal.) | <pre>Vedachalam, et al. v. Tata Consultancy Services,<br/>Ltd., et al.<br/>Plaintiffs allege that Tata: 1) breached its<br/>employment contracts with non-U.S. citizens<br/>deputed from India to the United States and 2)<br/>violated California law by depriving non-U.S.<br/>citizens deputed from India to California of<br/>their earned wages and accurate wage statements.<br/>Class Members consist of two classes:<br/>The National Class includes all non-U.S.<br/>citizens who were employed by Tata in the United<br/>States at any time from 2-14-2002 through 6-30-<br/>2005, and who were deputed to the United States<br/>after 1-1-2002 and before 6-30-2005.<br/>The National California Class includes all non-<br/>U.S. citizens who were employed by Tata in<br/>California at any time since 2-14-2002 and<br/>before 6-30-2005.</pre> | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>visit:<br><u>www.Tataclassaction.</u><br><u>com</u>   |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court      | Case Name  | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link  |
|----------------|-------------|------------|--|---------------------|---|
| Dutt           |             |            | Summary of Issue   | Date                |   |
| 3-1-2013       | 08-CV-04295 | (W.D. Mo.) | <pre>David D. Haile v. Debt Shield, Inc. and<br/>NoteWorld, LLC<br/>This lawsuit is about whether Debt Shield and/or<br/>NoteWorld were required by law to ensure that<br/>its customers' funds were deposited in an<br/>interest-bearing account or invested to earn a<br/>return until the funds were disbursed in<br/>accordance with the Debt Shield debt settlement<br/>programs and the customers' instructions;<br/>whether Debt Shield had to pay for fees charged<br/>to and paid by customers to NoteWorld; and<br/>whether these companies might be liable to their<br/>customers for money damages based on these<br/>claims. Plaintiff asserts claims under theories<br/>of breach of fiduciary duty and/or violation of<br/>the Missouri Merchandising Practices Act, which<br/>the Court certified as the "Class Claims."<br/>Class Members consist of four Subclasses:<br/>Subclass One - All customers of Debt Shield who<br/>enrolled with Debt Shield from 1-1-2004 to 9-19-<br/>2007, signed a Debt Negotiation Agreement with<br/>Debt Shield, and deposited funds into an account<br/>owned or directed by NoteWorld pursuant to a<br/>Debit Authorization Form.<br/>Subclass Two - All Missouri residents who<br/>enrolled with defendant Debt Shield from 1-1-<br/>2004 to 9-19-2007, signed a Debt Negotiation<br/>Agreement with Debt Shield, and deposited funds<br/>into an account owned or directed by NoteWorld<br/>pursuant to a Debit Authorization Form.</pre> | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>visit:<br><u>www.DebtShieldClassA</u><br><u>ction.com</u> |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court        | Case Name  | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link   |
|----------------|-------------|--------------|--|---------------------|--|
| Date           |             |              | Summary of Issue   | Date                |  |
|                |             |              | Subclass Three - All customers of Debt Shield<br>who enrolled with Debt Shield from 1-1-2004 to<br>the present who executed a Debt Negotiation<br>Agreement with Debt Shield, deposited funds into<br>an account owned or directed by NoteWorld, and<br>were charged fees by Noteworld that were not<br>reimbursed by Debt Shield.<br>Subclass Four - All Missouri residents who were<br>customers of Debt Shield from 2004 to the<br>present who executed a Debt Negotiation<br>Agreement with Debt Shield, deposited funds into<br>an account owned or directed by NoteWorld, and<br>were charged fees by NoteWorld that were not<br>reimbursed by Debt Shield.  |                     |  |
| 3-1-2013       | 11-CV-212   | (W.D. Okla.) | Chieftain Royalty Company and Jack Lancet v. QEP<br>Energy Company<br>Plaintiffs allege underpayments of royalties<br>owed to the royalty owners regarding wells<br>operated by QEP Energy ("QEP") in Oklahoma or on<br>Oklahoma wells where QEP, as non-operator,<br>separately marketed gas. Class Representatives<br>allege QEP accomplished this through various<br>improper deductions and reductions from royalty<br>payments including, but not limited to, the<br>following: (1) deducting direct and indirect<br>fees for marketing, gathering, compression,<br>dehydration, processing, treatment, and other<br>similar services; (2) not paying royalty on<br>wellhead gas used off the lease premises or in<br>the manufacture of products; and (3) not paying<br>royalty on condensate that dropped out of the<br>gas stream. | 5-28-2013           | For more information<br>visit or call:<br><u>www.Chieftain-QEP.com</u><br>866 880-0070 |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court | Case Name  | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link |
|----------------|-------------|-------|--|---------------------|--------------|
|                |             |       | Summary of Issue   | Date                |              |
|                |             |       | Class Members consist of all non-excluded<br>persons or entities who are or were royalty<br>owners in Oklahoma wells where QEP Energy<br>Company is or was the operator (or, as a non-<br>operator, QEP separately marketed gas)<br>("Class"). The Class Claims related only to<br>payment for gas and its constituents (helium,<br>residue gas, natural gas liquids, nitrogen and<br>condensate) produced from the wells. The Class<br>does not include overriding royalty owners or<br>other owners who derive their interest through<br>the oil and gas lessee. The Class is divided<br>into the following subclasses:<br>Subclass 1: All Class members who have or had a<br>direct lessor-lessee relationship with QEP.<br>Subclass 1(a): where QEP is or was the Operator<br>of Oklahoma wells.<br>Subclass 2: All Class members who do not or did<br>not have a direct lessor-lessee relationship<br>with QEP.<br>Subclass 2(a): where QEP is or was the operator<br>of the Oklahoma wells.<br>Subclass 2(b): where QEP is or was the operator<br>of the Oklahoma wells. | Date                |              |
|                |             |       | <pre>does not include overriding royalty owners or<br/>other owners who derive their interest through<br/>the oil and gas lessee. The Class is divided<br/>into the following subclasses:<br/>Subclass 1: All Class members who have or had a<br/>direct lessor-lessee relationship with QEP.<br/>Subclass 1(a): where QEP is or was the Operator<br/>of Oklahoma wells.<br/>Subclass 1(b): where QEP, as non-operator of<br/>Oklahoma wells, separately marketed gas.<br/>Subclass 2: All Class members who do not or did<br/>not have a direct lessor-lessee relationship<br/>with QEP.<br/>Subclass 2(a): where QEP is or was the operator<br/>of the Oklahoma wells.<br/>Subclass 2(b): where QEP, as non-operator of</pre>  |                     |              |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court      | Case Name  | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link  |
|----------------|-------------|------------|--|---------------------|---|
|                |             |            | Summary of Issue   | Date                |   |
| 3-5-2013       | 11-CV-01691 | (E.D. Mo.) | <pre>Nancy Albright, et al. v. The Bi-State<br/>Development Agency of the Missouri-Illinois<br/>Metropolitan District d/b/a Metro<br/>Plaintiffs allege that MetroLink willfully<br/>violated the Fair and Accurate Credit<br/>Transactions Act by printing on customer<br/>receipts the expiration date of its customer's<br/>credit or debit card.<br/>Class Members are all individuals who used a<br/>personal credit or debit card to purchase a<br/>MetroLink ticket or pass from a MetroLink Ticket<br/>Vending Machine ("MetroLink TVM") between 1-21-<br/>2010 and 8-16-2011, and received an<br/>electronically printed receipt that disclosed<br/>the expiration date of the credit or debit card<br/>used to make payment.</pre> | 7-3-2013            | For more information<br>write to:<br>Richard J. Doherty<br>Bock & Hatch LLC<br>134 N. LaSalle Street<br>Suite 1000<br>Chicago, IL 60602                       |
| 3-6-2013       | 10-CV-00095 | (D.S.C.)   | Robertson, et al. v. Sea Pines Real Estate<br>Companies, Inc., et al.<br>Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants conspired<br>to restrain the ability of certain brokerages to<br>compete in the area served by Hilton Head<br>Multiple Listing Services (MLS), which includes<br>the counties of Beaufort, Jasper, Allendale,<br>Bamberg, Barnwell, Colleton, Hampton and<br>Orangeburg. The lawsuit claims that by limiting<br>the ability of certain brokerages to compete<br>effectively for real estate listings, Defendants<br>were able to maintain commission rates in the<br>entire Hilton Head MLS service area at<br>artificially high levels.  | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>write to:<br>Brian D. Penny, Esq.<br>Goldman Scarlato Karon<br>& Penny, P.C.<br>101 E. Lancaster Ave.<br>Suite 204<br>Wayne, PA 19087 |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court       | Case Name  | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link  |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|--|---------------------|---|
| 3-6-2013       | 11-CV-05195 | (S.D.N.Y.)  | Summary of Issue<br>Class Members are all individuals or businesses<br>that purchased defendants' real-estate brokerage<br>services in connection with the sale of a home<br>or lot in the MLS Services Area from 1-14-2006<br>through 9-17-2007.<br>Copi and Purcell, et al. v. Brainfuse, Inc.<br>(Agreement and Stipulation of Settlement and<br>Release) (see CAFA 2-13-2013)<br>Plaintiffs allege: 1) violations of the Fair<br>Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), for failing to pay<br>Plaintiffs and Class Members minimum wages and<br>overtime, and 2) violations of the Illinois<br>Minimum Wage Law ("IMWL"), for failing to pay<br>Plaintiffs and Illinois Class Members minimum<br>wage and overtime. Specifically, Plaintiffs<br>sought, among other things, unpaid wages,<br>including minimum wage and overtime, interest,<br>penalties, liquidated damages, and attorneys'<br>fees and costs.<br>Class Members are all persons who worked for<br>Brainfuse, Inc. in the United States as an<br>instant or pre-assigned access tutor at any time | Date<br>5-22-2013   | For more information<br>write to or call:<br>Jeffrey D. Dahl<br>Dahl Administration,<br>Inc.<br>6465 Wayzata Boulevard<br>Suite 420<br>Minneapolis MN 55426<br>952 562-3600 |
| 3-6-2013       | 12-CV-07971 | (C.D. Cal.) | <pre>from 8-1-2008 to 12-31-2011. Tessa Owen, et al., v. Fresh, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' retail legetions represented and recorded represented</pre>  | Not set<br>yet      | For more information write to:  |
|                |             |             | locations requested and recorded personal<br>identification information (street address,<br>email addresses, telephone numbers, zip codes,<br>and other information) from its customers who<br>paid for merchandise using a credit card, in  |                     | Jason M. Wuchetich<br>Wucetich & Korovilas LLP.<br>222 North Sepulveda Blvd.<br>Suite 2000<br>El Segundo, CA 90245  |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court      | Case Name   | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link  |
|----------------|-------------|------------|---|---------------------|---|
| Date           |             |            | Summary of Issue  | Date                |   |
|                |             |            | violation of California law.<br>Class Members are all persons who purchased<br>merchandise with a credit card at any Fresh,   |                     |   |
|                |             |            | Inc. retail store in California, and were asked<br>to provide and did provide personal<br>identification information including street<br>address, email address, zip code, and/or<br>telephone number between 8-8-2011 and 1-21-2012.   |                     |   |
| 3-7-2013       | 09-CV-8011  | (S.D.N.Y.) | <pre>In re: Direxion Shares ETE Trust<br/>Plaintiffs allege that Direxion's registration<br/>statement and prospectus supplements contained<br/>false and misleading statements and omissions<br/>regarding the Direxion Funds. Lead Plaintiffs<br/>allege that Defendants materially misrepresented<br/>or failed to disclose information related to<br/>investments in the Direxion Funds, including the<br/>risk that investors who held Direxion Fund<br/>shares for longer than a single trading period<br/>were subject to undisclosed volatility risk,<br/>compounding and rebalancing risk, holding period<br/>risk, and hedging risk. Lead Plaintiffs further<br/>allege that investors who held Direxion Fund<br/>shares for longer than a single trading period<br/>suffered losses when the risk materialized.<br/>Class Members are all persons and entities who<br/>purchased or otherwise acquired shares of any of<br/>the following Funds from 11-3-2008 through 4-9-<br/>2009, inclusive ("Class Period") and who were<br/>damaged thereby: the Direxion Financial Bear 3X<br/>Shares (FZA), Direxion Energy Bear 3X Shares<br/>(ERY), Direxion Large Cap Bear 3X Shares (BGZ),</pre> | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>write, call or e-<br>mail:<br>Maja Lukic<br>Wolf Haldenstein Adler<br>Freeman & Herz LLP<br>270 Madison Avenue<br>New York, NY 10016<br>(212) 545-4600<br>lukic@whafh.com |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court        | Case Name   | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link   |
|----------------|-------------|--------------|---|---------------------|--|
|                |             |              | Summary of Issue  | Date                |  |
|                |             |              | and the Direxion Small Cap Bear 3X Shares (TZA).  |                     |  |
| 3-8-2013       | 06-CV-12967 | (S.D.N.Y)    | <pre>Panther Partners, Inc. v. Ikanos Communications,<br/>Inc., et al.<br/>Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to<br/>"disclose any known trends or uncertainties that<br/>have had or that the registrant reasonable<br/>expects will have a material favorable or<br/>unfavorable impact on net sales or revenues" as<br/>was required by §11 of the Securities Act of<br/>1933 ("Securities Act") and Item 303 of<br/>Regulation S-K. More specifically, Lead<br/>Plaintiff alleges: (i) that Defendants knew the<br/>defect rates for a certain version of Ikanos's<br/>telecommunication chips were abnormally high and<br/>causing failures in systems where they were<br/>deployed; and (ii) that this version of<br/>telecommunication chips was sold to Ikanos's two<br/>largest customers, which accounted for 72% of<br/>the Company revenue.<br/>Class Members are all persons who purchased the<br/>common stock of Ikanos Communication, Inc. in<br/>the Company's Secondary Offering of common stock<br/>on or about 3-17-2006.</pre> | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>write to:<br>James N. Kramer<br>Orrick, Herrington &<br>Sutcliffe LLP<br>The Orrick Building<br>405 Howard Street<br>San Francisco, CA 94105 |
| 3-11-2013      | 10-CV-00018 | (E.D. Wash.) | In re: Sterling Financial Corp. ERISA Litigation<br>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants were<br>fiduciaries of the Plan and violated fiduciary  | Not set<br>yet      | For more information write to:   |
|                |             |              | duties under ERISA that they owed to Plan<br>participants and beneficiaries. In the<br>Complaint, Plaintiffs have asserted causes of<br>action for the losses suffered by the Plan as   |                     | Andrew Volk<br>Hagens Berman<br>1918 Eighth Avenue<br>Suite 3300   |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court       | Case Name  | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link   |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|--|---------------------|--|
|                |             |             | Summary of Issue<br>the result of the alleged breaches of fiduciary<br>duty by Defendants.<br>Class Members are all persons who were<br>participants in or beneficiaries of the Sterling<br>401(k) Plan at any time between 10-27-2007 and<br>2-28-2013 and whose Plan accounts included<br>investments in the Sterling Financial<br>Corporation (SFC) Stock.  | Date                | Seattle, WA 98101  |
| 3-11-2013      | 10-CV-01089 | (N.D. Cal.) | Jose Tijero and Amanda Godfrey v. Aaron<br>Brothers, Inc.<br>Plaintiffs allege that Aaron Brothers failed<br>under California law and the Fair Labor<br>Standards Act, to pay such employees overtime<br>wages, provide meal periods and/or rest breaks,<br>pay minimum wages for "off the clock" work, pay<br>all compensation due at termination, provide<br>accurate wage statements, and pay card law<br>violations, and that Aaron Brothers is liable to<br>pay non-exempt, hourly employees back pay,<br>interest and penalties.<br>Class Members are all persons who worked for<br>Aaron Brothers, Inc. as non-exempt, hourly<br>employees within the State of California at any<br>time during the period from 5-7-2005 to [order<br>granting preliminary approval] according to<br>Aaron Brothers' payroll records. | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>write, call or fax:<br>Kristopher P. Badame<br>Badame & Associates, APC<br>Lake Forest, CA 92630<br>949 770-2867<br>866 230-3044<br><u>kbadame@badameandassociat</u><br>es.com |
| 3-13-2013      | 05-CV-2237  | (S.D.N.Y.)  | In re: DDAVP ("Desmopressin") Indirect Purchaser<br>Antitrust Litigation<br>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants engaged in a   | 12-16-2013          | For more information call or visit:  |

| Notice    | Case Number | Court       | Case Name  | Fairness        | Website Link  |
|-----------|-------------|-------------|--|-----------------|---|
| Date      |             |             | Summary of Issue   | Hearing<br>Date |   |
|           |             |             | <pre>course of conduct to delay the sale of generic<br/>versions of DDAVP tablets in violation of<br/>federal and state antitrust laws and consumer<br/>protection laws.<br/>Class Members are all persons or entities<br/>throughout the United States and its territories<br/>who purchased and/or paid for DDAVP or generic<br/>versions of DDAVP or generic versions of DDAVP<br/>for consumption by themselves, their families,<br/>or their members, employees, insureds,<br/>participants or beneficiaries (the "Class")<br/>during the period from 2-25-2001, through the<br/>date on which the anticompetitive effects of<br/>Defendants' conduct cease ("the Class Period").<br/>For purposes of the Class definition, person and<br/>entities "purchased" DDAVP if they paid some or<br/>the entire purchase price.</pre> |                 | 1 866 905-8130<br><u>www.ddavpsettlement.co</u><br><u>m</u>   |
| 3-13-2013 | 08-CV-22572 | (S.D. Fla.) | In re BankUnited Securities Litigation<br>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants are in<br>violation of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934<br>(the "Exchange Act") and Rule 10b-5 promulgated<br>thereunder. Lead Plaintiffs and other members<br>of the Class (as defined herein) purchased<br>BankUnited common stock during the Class Period<br>at prices that were artificially inflated as a<br>result of Defendants' false and misleading<br>statements and material omissions concerning<br>BankUnited in violation of the Exchange Act.<br>Class Members are all persons or entities who<br>purchased or acquired shares of BankUnited<br>common stock during the period from 10-24-2006   | 6-12-2013       | For more information<br>visit:<br><u>www.BankUnitedSecuri</u><br><u>tiesLitigation.com</u><br>or<br><u>www.BermanDeValerio.</u><br><u>com</u> |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court      | Case Name   | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link  |
|----------------|-------------|------------|---|---------------------|---|
|                |             |            | Summary of Issue<br>through and including 6-18-2008 and who were<br>damaged thereby.  | Date                |   |
| 3-14-2013      | 09-CV-2351  | (N.D. Ga.) | <pre>In re: Immucor, Inc. Securities Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated federal securities laws by making false and misleading statements that artificially inflated Immucor's stock prices resulting in economic loss to the Class. Class Members are all persons or entities who purchased or otherwise acquired the common stock of Immucor, Inc. during the period from 10-19- 2005, through and including 6-25-2009.</pre>  | 6-12-2013           | For more information<br>write, call or e-<br>mail:<br>Coughlin Stoia Geller<br>Rudman & Robbins LLP<br>Darren J. Robbins<br>Matthew P. Montgomery<br>655 West Broadway<br>Suite 1900<br>San Diego, CA 92101<br>619 231-1054<br>619 231-7423 |
| 3-14-2013      | 06-CV-3830  | (D.N.J.)   | <pre>Pro, et al. v. Hertz Equipment Rental<br/>Corporation (HERC)<br/>Plaintiffs allege that HERC violated the New<br/>Jersey Consumer Fraud Act in charging a<br/>contractual Environmental Recovery Fee in<br/>connection with the Optional Loss Damage Waiver<br/>product that HERC offers to customers who rent<br/>equipment from HERC.<br/>Class Members are all individuals who rented<br/>equipment from HERTZ Equipment Rental<br/>Corporation, and paid a Loss/Damage Waiver<br/>("LDW") and/or Environmental Recovery Fee<br/>("ERF") between [Date] and [the date of<br/>Preliminary Approval].</pre> | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>write or e-mail:<br>James E. Cecchi, Esq.<br>Carella, Bryne, Cecchi,<br>Olstein, Brody &<br>Angello, P.C.<br>5 Becker Farm Road<br>Roseland, NJ 07068<br><u>decklund@carellabyrne.com</u>                           |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court       | Case Name   | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link  |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---|---------------------|---|
| Date           |             |             | Summary of Issue  | Date                |   |
| 3-14-2013      | 10-CV-00061 | (C.D. Cal.) | Jeremah Johnson v. General Mills, Inc., et al.<br>Plaintiffs allege that General Mills, Inc. and<br>YoPlait USA, Inc. ("Defendants") engaged in<br>deceptive and unfair conduct in violation of<br>California laws by advertising that its YoPlus®-<br>branded yogurt products provide digestive health<br>benefits that plain yogurt does not provide.<br>Class Members are all who purchased YoPlus®<br>yogurt in the United States between 7-26-2007<br>and 7-5-2012, inclusive.   | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>visit:<br><u>www.YoPlusSettlement</u><br>.com   |
| 3-15-2013      | 11-CV-00665 | (C.D. Cal.) | <pre>Anna Sadowska, et al. v. Volkswagen Group of<br/>America, Inc., et al.<br/>Plaintiffs allege that the Continuous Variable<br/>Transmission Control Module ("CVT")<br/>transmissions of 2002-2006 model years Audi A4<br/>and Audi A6 vehicles did not function properly,<br/>requiring repair or replacement.<br/>Class Members are all current and former<br/>purchasers and lessees of 2002-2006 model years<br/>Audi A4 and Audi A6 vehicles originally equipped<br/>with factory-installed CVT transmissions, which<br/>were imported and distributed by Volkswagen<br/>Group of America, Inc. for sale or lease in the<br/>United States.</pre> | 9-23-2013           | No information  |
| 3-18-2013      | 12-CV-00154 | (N.D. Cal.) | James Gross v. Symantec Corp. and PC Tools, Ltd.<br>Plaintiffs allege that certain Software Products<br>- PC Tools Registry Mechanic, PC Tools<br>Performance Toolkit, and Norton Utilities - did   | 4-19-2013           | For more information<br>write to:<br>Jay Edelson<br>Rafey S. Balabanian |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court     | Case Name   | Fairness<br>Hearing<br>Date | Website Link  |
|----------------|-------------|-----------|---|-----------------------------|---|
|                |             |           | Summary of Issue<br>not perform certain functions as advertised.<br>Class Members are all individuals and entities<br>residing in the United States and its<br>territories that, prior to [date of preliminary<br>approval], purchased from an authorized seller a<br>license to use any of the following software in<br>the United States and its territories: PC Tools<br>Registry Mechanic and PC Tools Performance<br>Toolkit released since 6-1-2007, and Norton<br>Utilities 14.0 trough 16.0.  | Date                        | Benjamin H. Richman<br>Chandle R. Givens<br>Edelson McGuire LLC<br>350 N. LaSalle,<br>Suite 1300<br>Chicago, IL 60654                       |
| 3-18-2013      | 10-CV-00755 | (D. Nev.) | Janith Martinez, et al., v. Realogy Corporation,<br>et al.<br>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants marketed<br>health insurance programs offered by the<br>Association of Franchise and Independent<br>Distributors, LLC (a/k/a AFID, LLC) to Realogy<br>brand affiliated brokers, sales associates, and<br>employees, but the policy buyers did not receive<br>the health insurance as represented.<br>Class Members are all persons who are or where<br>Realogy brand affiliated brokers, sales<br>associates or employees, and their family<br>members as applicable, who between 7-2007 and 7-<br>2010, purchased and/or paid premiums for a<br>health insurance program sold by AFID, LLC<br>and/or "Association of Franchise and Independent<br>Distributors, LLC," that was marketed by a<br>Realogy brand during that time period. | Not set<br>yet              | For more information<br>write to or call:<br>Patrick Leverty<br>Leverty & Associates<br>832 Willow Street<br>Reno, NV 89502<br>775 322-6636 |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court       | Case Name   | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link  |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---|---------------------|---|
|                |             |             | Summary of Issue  | Date                |   |
| 3-18-2013      | 11-CV-09665 | (S.D.N.Y.)  | Gordon, et al. v. Sonar Capital Management LLC,<br>et al.<br>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants are in<br>violation of Sections 10(b), 20(a), and 20A of<br>the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and SEC Rule<br>10b-5 arising out of Defendants' alleged insider<br>trading. Plaintiffs also asserted claims under<br>Massachusetts Gen Laws ch. 109A §§ 5, 6<br>(fraudulent transfer) and unjust enrichment.<br>Class Members are all persons who sold shares of<br>the common stock of Sigma Designs, Inc. from 7-<br>13-2007 through and including 11-28-2007.  | 5-22-2013           | For more information<br>write to, call or<br>fax:<br>Edward F. Haber<br>Shapiro Haber & Urmy LLP<br>53 State Street<br>Boston, MA 02109<br>617 439-3939<br>Or<br>617 439-0134 |
| 3-19-2013      | 11-CV-20436 | (S.D. Fla.) | <pre>In re: Checking Account Overdraft Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Compass Bank ("Compass") improperly posted Debit Card Transactions from the highest to lowest dollar amount to increase the number of Overdraft Fees charged to account holders. Class Members includes anyone who: 1) had a Compass consumer deposit account that was accessible with a Compass debit card from 1-1- 2004 through 8-15-2010; 2) had a consumer deposit account that was accessible with a debit card: from 1-1-2004 through 4-1-2006 with Texas Bank, from 1-1-2004 through 3-14-2008 with State National Bank, from 1-1-2004 through 8-22-2008 with Texas State Bank, from 1-1-2004 through 11- 14-2008 with Laredo National Bank, and/or from 1-1-2004 through 6-11-2010 with BBVA Bancomer USA; and 3) was charged two or more overdraft</pre> | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>call or visit:<br><u>www.CompassBankOverd</u><br><u>raftSettlement.com</u><br>or<br>1 877 835-0549  |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court       | Case Name   | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link   |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---|---------------------|--|
| Date           |             |             | Summary of Issue  | Date                |  |
|                |             |             | fees on a single day as a result of posting<br>debit card transactions from highest to lowest<br>dollar amount.<br>Class includes persons who had two or more<br>overdraft fees caused by debits posted to the<br>person's account on a single day during the time<br>periods listed above.   |                     |  |
| 3-20-2013      | 12-CV-04961 | (N.D. Ill.) | <pre>Miller v. Red Bull North America, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that, in certain instances, when consumers sent a text message to Red Bull in response to an advertisement/promotion, Red Bull would send future texts without first getting express consent. The lawsuit claims this conduct violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. Class Members are all persons who received one or more texts from Red Bull between 1-2007 and 3-14-2013 without first providing express consent. The Settlement Class only encompasses "Non-Compliant Campaigns," which are Red Bull advertising campaigns where none of the advertisements promoting the campaign included language on their face indicating that participants would receive future texts.</pre> | 8-12-2013           | For more information<br>call:<br>1 888 643-2167                                |
| 3-20-2013      | 05-CV-4191  | (E.D. La.)  | Jared Vodanovich v. Boh Brothers Construction<br>Co.<br>Plaintiffs allege that levees and other flood<br>and water control structures failed and/or were<br>overtopped as a result of Hurricanes Katrina or   | 9-23-2013           | For more information<br>visit:<br><u>www.LeveeBreachClass.c</u><br><u>om</u> . |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court       | Case Name  | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link   |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|--|---------------------|--|
|                |             |             | Summary of Issue<br>Rita because they were not properly designed,<br>inspected, or maintained, and that this failure<br>caused property damage, personal injury and<br>other losses. The Settling Defendants<br>maintained the levees failed for reasons beyond<br>their control.<br>Class Members are all persons (a) who at the<br>time of Hurricane Katrina and/or Hurricane Rita:<br>(1) were located, present or residing in the<br>Hurricane Affected Geographic Area, or (2)<br>owned, leased, possessed, used or otherwise had<br>any interest in homes, places of business or<br>other immovable or movable property on or in the<br>Hurricane Affected Geographic Area, and (b) who<br>incurred any losses, damages and/or injuries<br>arising from, in any manner related to, or<br>connected in any way with Hurricane Katrina<br>and/or Hurricane Rita and any alleged Levee<br>failures and/or waters that originated from,<br>over, under or through the levees under the<br>authority and/or control of all of or any of the<br>Settling Defendants. | Date                |  |
| 3-21-2013      | 11-CV-00991 | (N.D. Ill.) | Arthur L. Brasher, et al. v. Broadwind Energy,<br>Inc., et al.<br>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants and dismissed<br>Defendants made false and misleading statements<br>and omissions during the period 3-16-2009<br>through 8-9-2010 about weakened demand and<br>liquidity issues facing Broadwind and about the<br>value of Broadwind's goodwill and intangible<br>assets. Plaintiffs assert that as a result of<br>these false and misleading statements and   | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>write, call or e-<br>mail:<br>William B. Federman<br>Federman & Sherwood<br>10205 N. Pennsylvania<br>Ave<br>Oklahoma City OK 73120<br>405 235-1560 |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court    | Case Name   | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link  |
|----------------|-------------|----------|---|---------------------|---|
|                |             |          | Summary of Issue  | Date                |   |
|                |             |          | omissions, the market price of Broadwind common<br>stock was artificially and improperly inflated<br>during the period 3-16-2009 through 8-9-2010,<br>and that Class Members overpaid for Broadwind<br>common stock purchased during this time period.<br>Class Members include all persons who purchased<br>or acquired the common stock of Broadwind during<br>the period 3-16-2009 through 8-9-2010,<br>inclusive, and who were damaged thereby.   |                     | wbf@federmanlaw.com   |
| 3-21-2013      | 11-CV-01823 | (D. Md.) | <pre>Singleton, et al. v. Domino's Pizza LLC Plaintiffs allege that Domino's pre-employment "Background Investigation and Consent Form," and Domino's alleged procurement of consumer reports on the basis of that form, violates the FCRA. Plaintiffs also allege that Domino's took adverse employment actions against certain individuals based on information contained in a consumer report without providing those individuals notice and a copy of such report in advance of such adverse action, also in violation of the FCRA. Class Members are persons 1) who applied for employment or were employed by Domino's and with respect to whom Domino's procured or caused to be procured the persons' consumer reports on or after 7-1-2009 on the basis of consent forms containing liability releases, and/or 2) with respect to whom Domino's took, on or after 7-1- 2009, an "adverse employment action" based on a consumer report without sending a pre-adverse action notice and/or a copy of the consumer</pre> | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>write to:<br>E. Michelle Drake<br>Nichols Kaster, PLLP<br>4600 IDS Center<br>80 South 8 <sup>th</sup> Street<br>Minneapolis, MN 55402 |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court       | Case Name   | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link  |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---|---------------------|---|
| Date           |             |             | Summary of Issue  | Date                |   |
|                |             |             | report.   |                     |   |
| 3-22-2013      | 12-CV-00915 | (D. Minn.)  | <pre>Hupperts v. Apogee Retail, LLC, et al.<br/>Plaintiffs allege that the companies that own<br/>and operate 30 thrift stores (known as Unique,<br/>Unique Thrift Store, Valu Thrift Store, and<br/>Value Village) in Colorado, Kentucky, Maryland,<br/>Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, New York and<br/>Virginia violated certain requirements of the<br/>Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act<br/>("FACTA"). Specifically, Hupperts claims that<br/>Defendants printed the expiration dates (but not<br/>the credit or debit card numbers) of customers'<br/>credit or debit cards on receipts presented to<br/>them, in violation of FACTA.</pre> |                     | For more information<br>write, call or e-<br>mail:<br>Thomas J. Lyons, Jr.<br>Consumer Justice Center,<br>P.A.<br>367 Commerce Court<br>Vadnais Heights, MN 55127<br>651 770-9707<br>tommycjc@aol.com |
| 3-22-2013      | 11-CV-9405  | (C.D. Cal.) | Bruce Eisen v. Porsche Cars North America, Inc.<br>Plaintiffs allege that some 2001-2005 model year<br>Porsche Boxster and 911 vehicles experienced or<br>may experience intermediate shaft ("IMS")<br>related engine damage before or after their<br>original Limited Warranty or Approved Certified<br>Pre-Owned Limited Warranty has expired and that<br>certain repairs were required or may be required<br>due to such damage.   | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>write to:<br>Stephen M. Harris<br>Knapp, Petersen &<br>Clarke<br>550 North Brand Blvd.<br>Suite 1500<br>Glendale, CA 91203  |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court      | Case Name  | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link  |
|----------------|-------------|------------|--|---------------------|---|
|                |             |            | Summary of Issue<br>Class Members are all persons in the United<br>States who currently own or lease or previously<br>owned or leased a Porsche Boxster and 911<br>vehicle model years 2001 - 2005 manufactured<br>with an IMS between 5-4-2001 and 2-21-2005.   | Date                |   |
| 3-22-2013      | 12-CV-4800  | (D.N.J.)   | John Telliho v. East Windsor Township and<br>American Traffic Solutions<br>Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants were<br>statutorily non-compliant as to requirements of<br>New Jersey's Pilot Red Light Camera Program,<br>N.J.S.A. § 39:4-8.14(e).<br>Class Members include all persons who received a<br>Notice of Violation issued by or on behalf of<br>one of the Municipalities alleging a traffic<br>violation that occurred on or before 8-1-2012,<br>and paid the fee or fine imposed thereby.   | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>write or call:<br>Stephen P. DeNittis<br>Sjabe; & Denittis<br>P.C.<br>5 Greentree Centre<br>Suite 302<br>Marlton, NJ 08053<br>856 797-9951  |
| 3-23-2013      | 11-CV-754   | (E.D. Va.) | <pre>Berry, et al. v. LexisNexis Risk &amp; Information<br/>Analytics Group, Inc., et al.<br/>Plaintiffs allege that LexisNexis prepared and<br/>sold Accurint® searches and reports that were<br/>"consumer reports" under the Fair Credit<br/>Reporting Act ("FCRA"). The lawsuit claims that<br/>LexisNexis failed to follow certain FCRA<br/>requirements that apply to "consumer reports."<br/>Both sides have agreed to the Settlement to<br/>resolve the case and provide benefits to<br/>consumers.<br/>Class Members are all persons listed in the<br/>Accurint® brand products databases between 11-</pre> | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>write, call, fax or e-<br>mail:<br>Gregory Thomas Berry,<br>Summer Darbonne, Rickey<br>Millen Shamoon Saeed,<br>Arthur B. Hernandez,<br>Erika A., Godfrey<br>Timothy Otten<br>James F. McCabe<br>Morrison & Forrester LLP<br>425 Market Street<br>San Francisco, CA 94105<br>415 268-7522 |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court       | Case Name   | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link  |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---|---------------------|---|
| Duce           |             |             | Summary of Issue  | Date                |   |
|                |             |             | 14-2006 and [date of preliminary approval]. The<br>databases contain names and addresses of all<br>U.S. residents who have a credit history, as<br>well as information from many public records<br>such as telephone directories, voter<br>registration records, motor vehicle<br>registrations, and mortgage records.  |                     | jmccabe@mofo.com  |
| 3-25-2013      | 09-CV-01786 | (S.D. Cal.) | <pre>Harry Dennis v. Kellogg Company Plaintiffs allege that Kellogg's advertising for its Frosted Mini-Wheats cereal was false and misleading. Class Members are all that purchased, not for resale purposes, Kellogg's Frosted Mini-Wheats cereal in the United States between 1-28-2008 and 10-1-2009.</pre>  | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>write to or call:<br>Timothy G. Blood<br>Blood Hurst &<br>O'Reardon, LLP<br>701 B Street<br>Suite 1700<br>San Diego, CA 92101<br>619 338-1100   |
| 3-25-2013      | 08-CV-810   | (C.D. Cal.) | Stetson, et al. v. West Publishing Corporation,<br>et al.<br>Plaintiffs allege that BAR/BRI violated federal<br>antitrust laws by agreeing with Kaplan to limit<br>competition in the market for full-service bar<br>review courses. Plaintiffs allege that BAR/BRI<br>agreed not to compete in the LSAT business and<br>that Kaplan agreed not to compete in the bar<br>review business, thereby allocating to BAR/BRI<br>the market for full-service bar review courses<br>in the United States and preventing a<br>competitive bar review course from being<br>marketed and sold. Plaintiffs also alleged that<br>BAR/BRI unlawfully acquired and maintained a | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>write to or call:<br>Alan Harris<br>David Zelenski<br>Harris & Ruble<br>6424 Santa Monica<br>Boulevard<br>Los Angeles, CA 90038<br>323 962-3777 |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court        | Case Name  | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link  |
|----------------|-------------|--------------|--|---------------------|---|
|                |             |              | Summary of Issue<br>monopoly in the market for full-service bar<br>review courses in the United States and also<br>conspired to monopolize that market. As a<br>result, Plaintiffs allege, competition in the<br>relevant market was adversely affected.<br>Class Members are all persons and entities who<br>paid for a BAR/BRI full-service bar review<br>course from 8-1-2006 through 2-28-2011.  | Date                |   |
| 3-26-2013      | 10-CV-9508  | (C.D. Cal.)  | <pre>Keegan v. American Honda Motor Co., Inc.<br/>Plaintiffs allege that Honda Civics were<br/>defectively designed, and that as a result the<br/>tires on some Civics wore out unevenly or<br/>prematurely.<br/>Class Members are all residents of the United<br/>States, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, or<br/>Guam and currently own or lease, or previously<br/>owned or leased, a Honda Civic, model years<br/>2006-2007, a Honda Civic Hybrid, model year<br/>2006-2007, or a Honda Civic Hybrid, model year<br/>2008 with a VIN between JHMFA385000001 and<br/>JHMFA385010456.</pre> | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>write to:<br>Michael A. Caddell<br>Caddell & Chapman<br>The Park in Houston<br>Center 131 Lamar,<br>Suite 1070<br>Houston, TX 77010 |
| 3-26-2013      | 11-CV-00013 | (W.D. Okla.) | Hitch Enterprises, et al. v. Cimarex Energy Co.<br>Plaintiffs allege Defendants inflated claims for<br>the deduction of post-production fees and<br>expenses relating to marketing, treating,<br>compressing, gathering, and processing of all<br>past production of mineral wells for all times<br>before 12-31-2012.   | 3-22-2013           | For more information<br>write to:<br>Rex A. Sharp<br>Gunderson, Sharp &<br>Walke, L.L.P.<br>5301 W. 75 <sup>th</sup> Street<br>Prairie Village, KS 66208    |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court    | Case Name  | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link   |
|----------------|-------------|----------|--|---------------------|--|
|                |             |          | Summary of IssueClass Members are all royalty owners (including  | Date                |  |
|                |             |          | predecessors, successors, and assigns) in Class<br>Wells in which Cimarex Energy Co. owns a working<br>interest.   |                     |  |
| 3-27-2013      | 12-CV-01602 | (D. Or.) | <pre>DuBeau, et al. v. Sterling Savings Bank, et al.<br/>Plaintiffs allege that Sterling Savings Bank<br/>(SSB) violated the Fair Labor Standards Act, and<br/>Oregon and Washington state law, by classifying<br/>mortgage loan officers ("MLOS") and other<br/>mortgage origination employees as exempt from<br/>overtime and minimum wage requirements.<br/>Plaintiffs also allege that SSB violated Oregon<br/>and Washington state law by "deducting" certain<br/>items from commissions such as credit report<br/>fees, appraisal fees, Rapid Rescore fees, and<br/>other such fees ("Loan-In-Process" or "LIP"<br/>charges).<br/>The court has preliminarily certified the<br/>following Settlement Classes:<br/>FLSA Class: Mortgage Loan Officers and other<br/>like exempt mortgage origination employees who<br/>are the subject of this lawsuit and who were<br/>employed by Defendants in Oregon and Washington<br/>within three (3) years prior to opting into this<br/>lawsuit under the FLSA by filing consents to<br/>join.<br/>Oregon Rule 23 Wage Hour Class: Mortgage Loan<br/>Officers and other like exempt mortgage</pre> | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>write to:<br>Rowdy Meeks Legal<br>Group LLC<br>435 Nichols Road<br>Suite 200<br>Kansas City, Mo. 64112 |
|                |             |          | origination employees who are the subject of<br>this lawsuit and who were employed by Defendants   |                     |  |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court      | Case Name  | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link   |
|----------------|-------------|------------|--|---------------------|--|
|                |             |            | Summary of Issue   | Date                |  |
|                |             |            | <pre>in Oregon from 9-6-2010 to the date of the<br/>court's order.<br/>Oregon Rule 23 Deduction Class: Mortgage Loan<br/>Officers and other like exempt mortgage<br/>origination employees who are the subject of<br/>this lawsuit and who were employed by Defendants<br/>in Oregon from 9-6-2006 to the date of the<br/>court's order and who had LIP charges or Catch-<br/>up Taxes (as defined in the Settlement</pre> |                     |  |
|                |             |            | Agreement) deducted from their wages.<br>Washington Rule 23 Wage Hour Class: Mortgage<br>Loan Officers and other like exempt mortgage<br>origination employees who are the subject of<br>this lawsuit and who were employed by Defendants<br>in Washington from 9-6-2010 to the date of the<br>court's order.  |                     |  |
|                |             |            | Washington Rule 23 Deduction Class: Mortgage<br>Loan Officers and other like exempt mortgage<br>origination employees who are the subject of<br>this lawsuit and who were employed by Defendants<br>in Washington from 9-6-2006 to the date of the<br>court's order and who had LIP charges or Catch-<br>up Taxes (as defined in the Settlement<br>Agreement) deducted from their wages.                                   |                     |  |
| 3-28-2013      | 08-CV-9522  | (S.D.N.Y.) | In re Citigroup Inc. Bond Litigation<br>Plaintiffs allege Defendants are in violation of<br>the Securities Act in that they made materially<br>untrue statements and omissions of material<br>facts in the registration statements for 48<br>public offerings by Citigroup, Inc.   | 7-23-2013           | For more information<br>write to:<br>Bernstein Litowitz<br>Berger & Grossmann LLP<br>Max W. Berger<br>Steven B. Singer |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court      | Case Name   | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link  |
|----------------|-------------|------------|---|---------------------|---|
|                |             |            | Summary of Issue<br>("Citigroup") of bonds and preferred securities<br>between 5-2006 and 8-2008 (the "Offerings").<br>Citigroup and other Defendants are being sued<br>for violation of the federal securities laws<br>based on the alleged misrepresentations in the<br>Public Offering Materials.<br>Class Members are all persons and entities who<br>purchased or otherwise acquired, from 5-11-2006<br>through and including 11-28-2008 (the<br>"Settlement Class Period"), the debt securities<br>(including certain medium term notes), series of<br>preferred stock and certain series of depository<br>shares representing interests in preferred<br>stock, in or traceable to the offerings of the<br>Bond Class Securities, and were damaged thereby. | Date                | John C. Browne<br>1285 Avenue of the<br>Americas<br>New York, NY 10019  |
| 3-28-2013      | 09-CV-02182 | (D. Minn.) | Dryer v. National Football League<br>Plaintiff alleges that the NFL violated the<br>publicity rights of retired NFL players when<br>film footage of games created during NFL<br>Players' careers continued to be used after the<br>NFL Players' retirement. It claims that these<br>uses, after an NFL player retires, are unlawful.<br>Class Members are:<br>Retired Players: all individuals who, as of<br>2013 [the date of the Preliminary Approval<br>Order], have retired, formally or informally,<br>from playing professional football with the NFL<br>or any Member Club or were formerly on any<br>roster of any Member Club and are no longer<br>under contract to a Member Club and are not   | Not set<br>yet      | For more information<br>write, visit or<br>call:<br>Daniel E. Gustafson<br>Gustafson Gluek PLLC<br>Canadian Pacific Plaza<br>120 South 6 <sup>th</sup> Street<br>Suite 2600<br>Minneapolis, MN 55402<br>www.NFLRetireePublicit<br>ySettlement.com<br>1-866 590-8525 |

| Notice<br>Date | Case Number | Court       | Case Name  | Fairness<br>Hearing | Website Link   |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|--|---------------------|--|
|                |             |             | Summary of Issue<br>seeking active employment as an NFL Player with<br>any Member Club.<br>Deceased Players: the heirs, executors,<br>administrators, beneficiaries, successors, and<br>assigns who own or control the Publicity Rights<br>for any deceased Retired Player.  | Date                |  |
| 3-29-2013      | 12-CV-05424 | (C.D. Cal.) | Christopher Taromina, et al. v. Gaspari<br>Nutrition, Inc.<br>Plaintiffs allege that improper statements were<br>made on the label and in advertisements for a<br>Gaspari Nutrition mood enhancing and energy<br>formula called "Spirodex" and that such<br>statements violated consumer protection laws and<br>were fraudulent.<br>Class Members are all purchasers of Spirodex for<br>personal use during the period 6-21-2008,<br>through 11-26-2012. | 6-10-2013           | For more information<br>call or visit:<br>866 800-6733<br>www.spirodexsettleme<br>nt.com |