Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
5-1-2013	12-CV-0662	(S.D. Cal.)	Carl Johnson and Teri Johnson v. Harvest Management Sub, LLC dba Holiday Plaintiffs allege that Holiday owes them and other current and former Floating Managers overtime compensation for time that those Floating Managers spent on call during their overnight shifts. Class Members are all persons who were employed by Harvest Management Sub TRS Corporation and/or Harvest Management Sub LLC dba Holiday Retirement in the United States as Floating Managers (also known as Regional Support Managers or Floaters) during either of the following two time periods depending on whether they were employed outside California or inside California: (a) outside of California, the period between (i) either (A) the date three years prior to the date they have opted into the Lawsuit; or (B) if they have not opted into the Lawsuit, then 11-13-2009; and (ii) the Approval Date; or (b) inside California, the period between 3-16-2008 and the Approval Date. These two periods together shall be the "Class Period".	Not set yet	For more information write to: George A. Hanson Jason M. Lindner Stueve Siegel Hanson LLP 550 West C Street Suite 1750 San Diego, CA 92101
5-1-2013	08-CV-05642	(C.D. Cal.)	Galvez, et al. v. Touch-Tel U.S.A., L.P. Plaintiffs allege that Defendant systematically misleads consumers who purchase and use pre-	9-16-2013	For more information e-mail or call:
			paid, non rechargeable telephone cards ("pre- paid calling cards") offered by Defendant, by misrepresenting the number of minutes		Justo Gonzalez Stokes Lawrence P.S.
			available.		Justo.Gonzalez@stoke

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
			-		slaw.com
			Class Members are all persons who purchased between 8-27-2004 to the present (the "Class Period") pre-paid calling cards that were produced, sold, administered, distributed, or otherwise offered to the public by Defendant.		206 892-2158
5-3-2013	12-CV-02664	(N.D. Cal.)	Richard W. Trammell v. Barbara's Bakery, Inc. Plaintiff alleges that Barbara's Bakery violated certain state laws and consumer protection statutes regarding the marketing and sale of certain products. Plaintiff claims that Barbara's Bakery misrepresented the nature of certain products to consumers by labeling them as "All Natural" when they were not. Class Members are all persons or entities that bought the Eligible Products from Barbara's Bakery U.S. retailers, Barbara's Bakery, or other third party retailers from 5-23-2008 through date of preliminary approval.	Not set yet	For more information visit: www.barbarasbakeryse ttlement.com
5-3-2013	06-CV-1738	(E.D.N.Y.)	<pre>In re: Vitamin C Antitrust Litigation Plaintiffs allege that vitamin C manufacturers conspired to fix, raise, maintain, or stabilize prices of vitamin C, limit the supply of vitamin C, and overcharge customers who purchased vitamin C. There are three Classes, see below: Direct Purchaser Damages Class: 1) Purchased vitamin C, 2) for delivery in the U.S. and 3)</pre>	8-29-2013	For more information call or visit: 1 866 684-9673 www.vitaminCantitrus t.com

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
2400			Summary of Issue	Date	
			directly from a Defendant (except Northeast Pharmaceutical) or another Chinese manufacturer of vitamin C and 4) between 12-1-2001 and 6-30- 2006 and without a contract, or with a contact that did not include an arbitration clause. Indirect Purchaser Damages Class: 1) purchased capsules or tablets containing vitamin C; 2) for use or consumption and not for resale; 3) between 12-1-2001 and 6-30-2006 and 4) currently live in and purchase was made in one of the following states: Arizona, California, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, or the District of Columbia.	Date	
			Injunction Class includes entities that: 1) purchased vitamin C manufactured by a Defendant, or products from any company containing vitamin C manufactured by the Defendants; 2) directly from a Defendant or from any other company; 3) for delivery in the U.S.; 4) between 12-1-2001 and now and 5) without a contract, or with a contract that did not include an arbitration clause.		
5-3-2013	11-CV-01291	(W.D. Wa.)	In re: Dendreon Corp., Class Action Litigation Plaintiffs allege violations of Federal Securities Laws alleging claims under Section 10(b), 20(a) and 20A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 on behalf of a class of all persons	Not set yet	For more information write to: Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP Blair A. Nicholas

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
Date			Summary of Issue	Date	
			<pre>who purchased or otherwise acquired the publicly-traded securities of Dendreon between 4-29-2010 and 8-3-2011, inclusive, and who were damaged thereby. Plaintiffs further allege false and misleading statements and omissions regarding the demand for Dendreon's first product, Provenge, and related statements concerning manufacturing capacity, physician adoption, and projected revenue from sales of Provenge were made by Dendreon to induce investors. Class Members are all persons who purchased or otherwise acquired Dendreon common stock between 4-29-2010 and 8-3-2011, inclusive, and who were damaged thereby.</pre>		Niki L. Mendoza 12481 High Bluff Drive Suite 300 San Diego, CA 92130
5-10-2013	04-CV-9141	(S.D.N.Y.)	<pre>In re: American International Group, Inc. Securities Litigation Plaintiff alleges that (i) the Gen Re Defendants knowingly, or with severe recklessness, designed and executed the Gen Re Transaction to inflate AIG's financial results; and (ii) the Gen Re Transaction defendants misled investors during the Class Period. Plaintiff also alleges that disclosures in February, March and April 2005 of a massive accounting fraud at AIG, including the Gen Re Transaction, resulted in AIG's \$3.9 billion restatement or adjustment of earnings in 5- 2005. Class Members are all persons who purchased or otherwise acquired AIG Securities during the</pre>	Not set yet	For more information write to: Thomas a. Dubbs Louis Gottlieb Labaton Sucharow LLP 140 Broadway New York, NY 10005

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
Duce			Summary of Issue	Date	
			period from 10-8-1999 through 4-1-2005, inclusive, including all persons and entities who held the common stock of HSB Group, Inc. ("HSB") at the time HSB was acquired by AIG in a stock for stock transaction, and all persons and entities who held the common stock of American General Corporation ("AGC") at the time AGC was acquired by AIG in a stock for stock transaction, and who were damaged thereby.		
5-7-2013	12-CV-02063	(D.N.J.)	Sophia Martina v. L.A. Fitness International, LLC Plaintiff alleges persons who purchased monthly dues membership with L.A. Fitness in New Jersey were charged and paid an extra month of dues in addition to the pre-paid last month dues contained in their membership agreements after they sent L.A. Fitness a notice of cancellation. Plaintiff alleges this practice violates certain New Jersey laws including the Health Club Services Act, the Consumer Fraud Act and the Truth in Consumer Contract Warranty and Notice Act. Class Members are all individuals who: (a) entered into a Monthly Dues Membership Agreement in the State of New Jersey with L.A. Fitness, and (b) who paid for an additional month of dues (in addition to the application of the provide last month of the provide l	Not set yet	For more information write to: Andrew R. Wolf The Wolf Law Firm, LLC 1520 U.S. Highway 130 Suite 101 North Brunswick, NJ 08902
			of pre-paid last month dues) after L.A. Fitness received a Notice of Cancellation during the period of 2-28-2006 through 3-31-2012, and (c) the payment of an additional month of dues was		

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue           not subsequently refunded.	Date	
5-7-2013	11-CV-1288	(S.D.N.Y.)	<pre>Collins, et al. v. Oilsands Quest Inc. (f/k/a Canwest Petroleum Corporation) Plaintiffs allege violations of §10(b), 20(a), and Rule 10B-5 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Class Members are all persons or entities who purchased or sold Oilsands Quest, Inc. shares or options between 3-20-2006 and 1-13-2011, inclusive.</pre>	6-14-2013	For more information write, call or fax: Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP Moses Silverman Andrew G. Gordon Robyn F. Tarnofsky 1285 Avenue of Americas New York, NY 10019 212 373-3000 212 757-3990
5-10-2013	11-CV-1002	(N.D. Ill.)	Cioe v. Cellco Partnership, et al. Ped v. Cellco Partnership, et al. Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants violated federal and state labor laws, by failing to pay Verizon Wireless retail employees overtime because of: (i) improper or untimely calculation and payment of overtime adjustments to the regular rate of pay based upon commission, bonus or other incentive compensation; (ii) deductions to overtime recorded or submitted by employees; and (iii) payment of overtime to workers classified as Salary Plus at a half-time rate. Class Members consist of two groups: The Class: All persons employed in a Verizon Wireless retail sales location in the United States (i.e., a store, kiosk, or in-store	Not set yet	For more information write to: Mark Bulgarelli Progressive Law Group LLC 1 N. LaSalle Street Suite 2255 Chicago, IL 60602

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
5-10-2013	09-CV-1048	(C.D. Cal.)	<pre>Summary of Issue location) who were classified and paid overtime as nonexempt or Salary Plus employees at any time from 3-16-2008 to and including 2-15-2013. The Subclass: All persons employed in a Verizon Wireless sales location in the United States (i.e., a store, kiosk, or in-store location) who were classified and paid overtime Salary Plus employees at any time from 3-16- 2008 to and including 2-15-2013. Salary Plus employees are part of the Class and Subclass.</pre> Masonek v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (a constituent member of In re: Medical Capital Securities Litigation, Case Number 10-CV-2145) Plaintiffs allege that Wells Fargo and the Bank of New York Mellon ("BNYM"), as hired trustees for Medical Capital, improperly disbursed millions of dollars in breach of their contractual duties to noteholders. Class Members are all who purchased or acquired notes issued by Medical Provider ("MP") II, III, IV, V and/or VI and did not received some or all of the principal or interest payments.	6-24-2013	For more information write, call, fax or e-mail: Mark C. Molumphy Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP San Francisco Airport Office Center 840 Malcolm road Suite 200 Burlingame, CA 94010 650 697-6000 650 697-0577 mmolumphy@cpmlegal.com
5-10-2013	09-CV-40152	(D. Mass.)	Cavallaro v. UMass Memorial Medical Center, Inc. ("UMMMC") Plaintiffs allege that UMMMC and nine other	Not set yet	For more information write to or call:
			defendants failed to pay hourly, non-exempt employees for all hours worked over 40 in a		Patrick J. Solomon Thomas & Solomon LLP

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue work week in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"). The litigation recently was amended for settlement purposes only. The amendment limits claims to those on behalf of hourly or non-exempt employees who work or worked in clinical positions during the relevant time period. The amendment also adds claims for alleged breach of contract, asserting that Defendant breached a contractual obligation to pay employees for all hours worked. Class Members are all current and former hourly, non-exempt clinical employees who worked for Defendant UMass Memorial Medical Center, Inc., and were not paid for all of the time they worked including applicable premium pay.	Date	693 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14607 585 272-0540
5-13-2013	09-CV-2042	(E.D. Mich.)	<pre>In re: Refrigerant Compressors Antitrust Litigation (All Direct Purchasers Actions) Plaintiff alleges that Defendants conspired to restrict the supplying of and raise and fix the prices of compressors with less than one horse power. The lawsuit claims that, as a result of this alleged conspiracy, purchasers paid more for compressors than they otherwise would have paid. Class Members are all persons or entities who purchased compressors in the United States, its territories and possessions, directly from any Defendant, including Settling Defendants, or from any of Defendants' parents, predecessors'</pre>	Not set yet	For more information write to: Robert N. Kaplan Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP 850 Third Avenue 14 <sup>th</sup> Floor New York, NY 10022 E. Powell Miller The Miller Law Firm, P.C. 950 West University Drive Suite 300 Rochester, MI 48307 Michael D. Hausfeld Hausfeld LLP 1700 K Street, N.W.

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue successors, subsidiaries, or affiliates, at any time during the period from and including 2-25- 2005 thru 12-31-2008 inclusive. Compressors include compressors of less than one horse power, excluding compressors used in air conditioning.	Date	Suite 650 Washington, DC 20006
5-15-2013	12-CV-04466	(N.D. Cal.)	<pre>Bolton v. U.S. Nursing Corp. Plaintiffs allege that U.S. Nursing failed to properly pay employees placed to work at healthcare facilities in California during trade disputes for all hours worked, improperly deducted 30 minutes of work time in certain situations, and failed to pay these employees their wages earned on a daily basis. The lawsuit also alleges that U.S. Nursing did not provide these employees accurate, itemized pay stubs in violation of the California Unfair Business Practices Act and the California Labor Code. Class Members are all present and former non- exempt U.S. Nursing employees who were placed to work in California healthcare facilities on a temporary basis during labor disputes at any time since 7-25-2008 through (date of preliminary approval). The Court also defined a subclass that consists of nurses whose time sheets, on one or more days, reflect a half- hour deducted from the total daily time worked when no meal period is otherwise identified for that day.</pre>	6-6-2013	For more information write, call or fax: Chavez & Gertler LLP Jonathan E. Gertler 42 Miller Ave. Mill Valley, CA 94941 415 381-5599 415 381-5572 Andrus Anderson LLP Lori Andrus 155 Montgomery Street San Francisco, CA 94104 415 986-1400 415 986-1474

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
5-15-2013	13-CV-00406	(C.D. Cal.)	<pre>Augustina Blanco v. CVS Pharmacy, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Rexall Sundown, Inc. and NBTY, Inc. and their affiliated companies (collectively, "Rexall") manufacture and sell joint health dietary supplements containing the ingredients glucosamine and chondroitin. Plaintiffs allege that certain claims made on the labeling of certain Rexall Glucosamine Products are false, deceptive, and misleading in violation of various state consumer protection acts.</pre> Class Members are all consumers who, during particular time periods and in certain U.S. locations, purchased for personal use and not resale or distribution certain joint health dietary supplements (a) sold by Rexall or any of its affiliates under the brand names of Rexall or its affiliates; or, (b) manufactured by Rexall or any of its affiliates but sold under another brand name by a company not affiliated with Rexall.	8-20-2013	For more information write to: Peter N. Freiberg Denlea & Carton, LLP One North Broadway Suite 509 White Plains, NY 10601
5-15-2013	09-CV-5533	(E.D. Pa.)	Frattarola, et al. v. Mercy Health System of Pennsylvania, et al. Plaintiffs alleged that a purported class of all hourly Mercy employees were not paid regular or statutorily required rates of pay for all hours worked and were not paid at time and one-half for hours they worked over 40 in a work week. It is also alleged that hourly Mercy employees regularly were unable to take their 30 minute unpaid meal breaks because of	7-17-2013	For more information write to: Nelson Thomas Michael Lingle Thomas & Solomon LLP 693 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14607 Patrick Matusky Caroline Austin

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
Date			Summary of Issue	Date	
			work obligations or had that 30 minute meal break period interrupted because of work obligations. Plaintiffs further allege that they were not properly compensated for time worked preliminary and postliminary to their regularly scheduled shifts and during training sessions.		Duane Morris LLP 30 S. 17 <sup>th</sup> Street Philadelphia, PA 19103
			Class Members are all non-exempt employees of any Mercy Releasee who worked for any Mercy Releasee during the Released Period and who: (a) received or are alleged to have received an unpaid meal break; (b) worked or are alleged to have worked time preliminary or postliminary to their regularly scheduled shift without proper compensation; or (c) worked or are alleged to have worked during training sessions without proper compensation.		
5-15-2013	12-CV-01177	(S.D. Cal.)	<pre>Anaya v. Quicktrim, LCC. Plaintiffs allege that improper statements were contained on the label and in advertisements for the Products that are part of the "Quick Trim Weight Loss System®", and that such statements violated consumer protection laws and various states' common and statutory laws, and various federal laws. Class Members are all purchasers of Quick Trim Products for personal use during the period 8- 14-2009 through 3-1-2013: (1) Quick Trim Sugar &amp; Carb Cheater®, (2) Quick Trim Fast Cleanse®, (3) Quick Trim Extreme Burn®, (4) Quick Trim Burn &amp; Cleanse®, (5) Quick Trim Hot Stix®, (6)</pre>	8-5-2013	For more information call or visit: 866 328-1994 www.anayasupplements ettlement.com

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
			Quick Trim Fast Shake®, (7) Quick Trim		
			Satisfy®, (8) Quick Trim Celluslim®,		
			(collectively, "Quick Trim Products").		
5-16-2013	12-CV-00222	(N.D. Cal.)	Tasha Smith and Fredierick Smith v. Intuit Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Intuit failed to	Not set yet	For more information visit:
			properly disclose the fee for the Refund		
			Processing Service as a finance charge, and		www.TurboTaxClassAct
			failed to properly disclose the Annual Percentage Rate ("APR") of what Plaintiffs		<u>ion.com</u>
			alleged was a loan. Plaintiffs allege that		
			Intuit's failure to make these disclosures		
			violated California's consumer protection laws		
			as well as the federal Truth-in-Lending Act.		
			Class Members are all Intuit customers in the		
			United States who used Intuit's TurboTax online		
			and utilized the Refund Processing Service from the time period from and including 1-12-2008,		
			through (date of preliminarily approval).		
5-16-2013	12-CV-508			Not cot	For more information
5-10-2013	12-00-508	(D.D.C.)	Richardson, et al. v. L'Orèal USA, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that L'Orèal made false and	Not set yet	write, call, fax or
			misleading statements suggesting availability	yec	e-mail:
			was limited exclusively to certain L'Oreal		C mail.
			products when consumers may purchase these		Michael Lieder
			products in major retail outlets where		Mehri & Skalet, PLLC
			professional salon services are not available.		1250 Conn., Ave, N.W. Suite 300
			Nationwide Class Members: All consumers		Washington, DC 20036
			throughout the United States who purchased		202 822-5100
			Matrix, Kerastase, Pureology and/or Redken		202 022-3100
			products during the liability period for their		202 822-4997

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue household use, rather than for resale or distribution, that were marketed under the brand name Matrix, Kerastase, Pureology and/or Redken and were labeled or advertised as sold and/or available only through professional salons or beauty schools.	Date	<u>mieder@findjustice.com</u>
5-17-2013	09-CV-2042	(E.D. Mich.)	<pre>In re Refrigerant Compressors Antitrust Litigation (Defendants: Embraco North America, Inc. and Whirlpool S.A.) (collectively, "Embraco") Plaintiffs allege that Defendants conspired to raise and fix the prices of compressors. The lawsuit claims that, as a result of this alleged conspiracy, purchasers paid more for compressors than they otherwise would have paid. The operative complaint alleges how the Defendants allegedly violated the U.S. antitrust laws by agreeing to set artificially high prices for, and restrict the supply of, compressors of less than one horse power.</pre> Class Members are all persons or entities who purchased Compressors in the United States, its territories and possessions, directly from any Defendant, including Settling Defendants, or from any of their parents, predecessors, successors, subsidiaries, or affiliates, at any time during the period from and including 2-25- 2005 up to and including 12-31-2008. Compressors include compressors of less than one horse power, excluding compressors used in air conditioning.	Not set yet	For more information write to: David H. Fink Fink + Associates Law 100 West Long Lake Road Suite 111 Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304 Robert N. Kaplan Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP 850 Third Avenue 14 <sup>th</sup> Floor New York, NY 10022 E. Powell Miller The Miller Law Firm, P.C. 950 West University Drive Suite 300 Rochester, MI 48307 Michael D. Hausfeld Hausfeld LLP 1700 K Street, N.W. Suite 650 Washington, DC 20006

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
5-17-2012	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, in violation of the FCRA. Class Members are all who: (1) applied for employment or were employed with Domino's and Domino's obtained a consumer report on the basis of a consent form containing a liability release, and/or (2) Domino's took an "adverse employment action" based on a consumer report and without sending the employee/applicants a pre-adverse action notice and/or a copy of the actual consumer report.</pre>	9-23-2013	For more information call or write to: 1 888 365-3008 KCC Class Action Services PO Box 43162 Providence, RI 02940
5-20-2013	09-MD-2042	(E.D. Mich.)	In re: Refrigerant Compressors Antitrust Litigation (Defendants: Danfoss A/S, Danfoss, Inc., Danfoss Commercial Compressors, Ltd., Danfoss Scroll Technologies, and Danfoss Turbocor Compressors)(incoming Defendants: Danfoss Flensburg GmbH, formerly Danfoss Compressors GmbH ("Danfoss Flensburg") (collectively "Danfoss") (See 5-17-2013 Notice)	Not set yet	For more information write to: David H. Fink Fink + Associates Law 100 West Long Lake Road Suite 111 Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
Date			Summary of Issue	Date	
5-20-2013	08-CV-07919	(C.D. Cal.)	<pre>Summer York v. Starbucks Corporation Plaintiffs allege that Starbucks violated California Labor laws including failure to pay overtime after 40 hours per week; required employees to work during meal periods without compensation; failed to provide or require employees to work during rest periods without compensation; failed to pay minimum wages to employees; failed to promptly pay all wages due to employees upon their discharge or resignation; and failed to accurately report wages paid as required by the California Labor Code. Class Members consist of hourly paid employees who have been employed by Defendant in the State of California within four years prior to the filing of this complaint until certification of the Class in this lawsuit.</pre>	10-28-2013	For more information call: Mark R. Curiel 310 728-3321
5-21-2013	12-CV-00154	(N.D. Cal.)	James Gross v. Symantec Corporation Plaintiffs allege that Defendants Symantec Corporation ("Symantec") and PC Tools, Ltd. ("PC Tools") sold computer software products which did not perform certain functions as advertised. Class Members are all individuals and entities residing in the United States and its territories that, prior to [date of preliminary approval], purchased from an authorized seller a license to use any of the following software in the United States and its territories: PC	Not set yet	For more information write to: Jay Edelson Rafey S. Balabanian Benjamin H. Richman Chandler R. Givens Eldelson LLC 350 N. LaSalle Suite 1300 Chicago, IL 60654

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
	08-CV-00042	(E.D.N.Y.)	Summary of Issue Tools Registry Mechanic and PC Tools Performance Toolkit released since 6-1-2007, and Norton Utilities 14.0 through 16.0. Precision Associates Inc., et al. v. Panalpina World Transport (Holding) Ltd., et al. Plaintiffs allege that global freight forwarders ("Defendants") conspired to fix prices for their services on routes between the U.S. and China, Hong Kong, Japan, Taiwan, and the U.K. Some of the companies who were sued have agreed to settlements. The lawsuit continues against the non-settling Defendants. Class Members are all persons who: 1) directly purchased Freight Forwarding Services; 2) from any of the settling or non-settling Defendants, their subsidiaries, or affiliates; 3) from 1-1- 2001 through 9-14-2012; 4) in the U.S., or		For more information Call U.S., International or visit: 1 877 276-7340 1 503 520-4400 www.freightforwardca se.com
5-23-2013	10-CV-2326 11-CV-2644 13-CV-0255	(E.D. Pa.)	outside the U.S. for shipments within, to, or from the U.S. "Freight Forwarding Services" means Freight Forwarding, transportation, or logistics services for shipments, including services relating to the organization or transportation of items via air, ocean, rail, and road, both nationally and internationally, and related activities such as customs clearance, warehousing, and ground services. Silver, et al. v. L.A. Fitness Intl, LLC Vaughn v. L.A. Fitness International, LLC Sible v. L.A. Fitness International, LLC	9-19-2013	For more information visit:
	13-00-0255		Plaintiffs allege that L.A. Fitness breached		www.USGymSettlement.

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
Date			Summary of Issue	Date	
			its contracts by failing to timely process its customers' requests to cancel their Monthly Dues Membership Agreement and that L.A. Fitness's Monthly Dues Membership Agreement violated state laws by including unfair, confusing or misleading language concerning the amount of advance notice a customer must provide to L.A. Fitness in order to cancel a membership with no further charges and for the customer to get the benefit of his or her prepaid last month's dues. The lawsuit also challenges the terms, policies and contract forms used for the Monthly Dues Membership. Class Members are all individuals who cancelled their Monthly Dues Membership Agreement with L.A. Fitness during the Class Period of 5-18- 2006 to 1-1-2013.		Com
5-23-2013	12-CV-2189	(N.D. Ohio)	<pre>Dombroff v. Cuyanhoga County, et al. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants: (1) had an agreed policy with local police departments not to obtain bail determinations from local municipal judges for persons arrested without a warrant, and instead to obtain bail determinations from a Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Judge; and (2) that, as a result of this policy, persons arrested without a warrant were detained without bail for additional unnecessary time, in violation of the U.S. Constitution and state law. Class Members are all persons from 8-27-2010 through 11-23-2012, were arrested in Cuyahoga</pre>	9-25-2013	For more information write to: Philip S. Kushner Kushner & Hamed Co., L.P.A. One Cleveland Center 1375 East Ninth Street Suite 1930 Cleveland, OH 44114

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue County by a municipality without a warrant, initially held in the municipal jail without bail and then transferred to the custody of the sheriff and were held for more than four days before bail was set by the Cuyanhoga County Common Pleas Court.	Date	
5-23-2013	11-CV-02159	(S.D. Cal.)	Chip Williams, Adelaida Galindez and Jupiter Ramirez v. Centerplate, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants: 1) failed to provide meal periods and rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof; 2) failed to pay wages for hours worked; 3) failed to provide and maintain uniforms and equipment; 4) failed to timely pay wages due at termination; 5) knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with itemized employee wage statement provisions; 6) violated the unfair competition law; and 7) are subject to enforcement of the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"). Class Members are current and former employees of Centerplate who worked in Covered Positions in the State of California during the covered time frame 5-9-2007 through the date of Preliminary Approval.	6-24-2013	For more information write to or call: Roger r. Carter The Carter Law Firm 2030 Main Street Suite 1300 Irvine, CA 92614 949 260-4737
5-24-2013	11-CV-03722	(C.D. Cal.)	Zachary Lewy, et al. v. Gulf Resources, Inc., et al. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the federal securities laws because Gulf Resources allegedly made false and misleading statements to the investing public including that (1) Gulf	6-15-2013	For more information Write, call or fax Shearman & Sterling LLP Stephen D. Hibbard Four Embarcadero Center Suite 3800

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
			Resources overstated its 2009 fiscal year revenue and income; and (2) Gulf Resources failed to disclose certain related party transactions. Class Members are all purchasers or otherwise acquired Gulf Resources common stock during the period from 3-16-2009 to and including 4-26- 2011.	Date	San Francisco, CA 94111 415 616-1100 415 616-1199
5-24-2013	11-CV-610	(E.D. Va.)	<pre>In re: Computer Sciences Corporation Securities Litigation (CSC) Plaintiffs allege that Defendants made false and misleading statements about the performance under CSC's \$5.4 billion contract with National Health Services of the UK (the "NHS Contract"). Class Representative asserts that under the NHS Contract, CSC agreed to build a computerized medical records system and develop the necessary software to create digitized medical records for all UK residents. The second scheme allegedly arises from Defendants' purportedly false and misleading statements and omissions concerning CSC's internal controls.</pre>	9-19-2013	For more information Write to: Joseph A. Fonti Labaton Sucharow LLP 140 Broadway New York, NY 10005

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
Date			Summary of Issue	Date	
5-24-2013	11-CV-06741 11-CV-07819	(N.D. I11.)	Redman v. RadioShack Corporation Aliano, et al. v. RadioShack Corporation Plaintiffs allege that Defendant violated certain requirements imposed by FACTA. Specifically, Plaintiffs claim that Defendant printed the expiration date of credit or debit cards on receipts provided to Class Members, in violation of FACTA. Plaintiffs have not alleged any actual monetary damage. In the absence of actual monetary damages, in order for Plaintiffs to prevail, the Court would have to find the Defendant willfully violated FACTA. Class Members are all persons who, between 8- 24-2010 and 11-21-2011, paid by credit or debit card for products or services and received an electronically-printed receipt from any Store that contained the expiration date of the person's credit or debit card.	Not set yet	For more information write to: Paul F. Markoff Markoff Leinberger LLC 134 N LaSalle Street Suite 1050 Chicago, IL 60602 Thomas A. Zimmerman Zimmerman Law Offices, P.C. 77 W. Washington St. Suite 1220 Chicago, IL 60602
5-24-2013	12-CV-00826	(E.D. Va.)	In re: GeoEye, Inc. Shareholder Litigation Plaintiffs allege the GeoEye Board of Directors breached their fiduciary duties in attempting to sell GeoEye to Digital Globe, Inc. by means of an unfair process and for an unfair price. Plaintiffs allege Defendants have violated the SEC Act by omitting material facts necessary to support the Board recommendation of sale statement. Plaintiffs also allege Defendants breach their fiduciary duty of candor by failing to disclose material information to GeoEye shareholders that was necessary for shareholders to determine whether to vote in	7-26-2013	For more information call: Alexandra S. Peurach 202 879-5133

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
			favor of the proposed sale. Class Members are all persons or entities who held shares of common stock of GeoEye, Inc., ("GeoEye" or the "Company"), either of record or beneficially, from and including 7-22-2012 through and including 1-31-2013, including any and all of their respective successors-in- interest, predecessors, representatives, trustees, executors, administrators, heirs, assigns or transferees, immediate and remote, and any person or entity acting for or on behalf of, or claiming under any of them, and each of them.		
5-28-2013	12-CV-9393	(N.D. I11.)	Juan Escobedo v. American Tire Distributors, Inc. Plaintiffs alleges American Tire Distributors, Inc. ("ATD") violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act when Defendant took adverse action against Plaintiffs without; 1) pre-adverse action disclosure that included copy of the consumer report; 2) a description in writing of Plaintiffs' rights under the FCRA; and 3) the opportunity to dispute the accuracy of the reported information contained in the credit report. Class Members are all job applicants who applied to work for or worked for American Tire Distributors, Inc. during the time frame of 11- 26-2010 to 11-26-2012.	Not set yet	For more information call: 1 888 407-6673

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
Date			Summary of Issue	Date	
5-29-2013	08-CV-01221	(N.D.N.Y.)	<pre>Myers v. Crouse Health systems, Inc., et al. Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants failed to keep accurate records of all time worked by current and former hourly employees (collectively "Hourly Employees"), and that Hourly Employees were not appropriately paid for all time they actually worked, including work performed during meal breaks, before or after their scheduled shifts, and in certain types of trainings. Class Members are all individuals who have previously filed consents to join the Action and who have not been dismissed (the "Opt-In Plaintiffs"), and all individuals who timely return a valid and effective claim form containing a consent to join the action and who worked for Crouse Hospital as an Hourly Employee.</pre>	Not set yet	For more information write, call or fax: Patrick J. Solomon Guy A. Talia 693 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14607 585 272-0540 595 272-0574
5-29-2013	08-CV-01220	(N.D.N.Y.)	Colozzi, et al. v. St. Joseph's Hospital Health Center, et al. (Same as above)	Not set yet	For more information write call or fax: Patrick J. Solomon Guy A. Talia 693 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14607 585 272-0540 595 272-0574

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness Hearing	Website Link
			Summary of Issue	Date	
5-29-2013	08-CV-01219	(N.D.N.Y.)	Hamelin v. Faxton-St. Luke's Healthcare, et al. (Same as above)	Not set yet	For more information write, call or fax: Patrick J. Solomon Guy A. Talia 693 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14607 585 272-0540 595 272-0574
5-30-2013	09-CV-02337	(D. Md.)	<pre>In re: Coventry Healthcare Inc., Sec. Litigation Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants deceived the investing public and caused Plaintiffs to purchase Coventry common stock at artificially inflated prices. Class Members are all persons who purchased the common stock of Coventry Healthcare Inc. between 2-9-2007 and 10-22-2008, inclusive.</pre>	Not set yet	For more information write or call: Rick Nelson c/o Shareholder Relations Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP 655 West Broadway Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101 800 449-4900
5-30-2013	12-CV-00065	(N.D. Ohio)	Richard Wolfe and Ruthie Collier v. American Greetings Corp. Plaintiffs allege that American Greetings used its employees' names and other information to invest in certain life insurance products often called "corporate owned life insurance." The Plaintiffs in the suits claim American Greetings did not have permission to use the employees' names and information for the	9-20-2013	For more information call: 1 800 422-0113

Notice	Case Number	Court	Case Name	Fairness	Website Link
Date			Summary of Issue	Hearing Date	
			investments and they are therefore entitled to compensation. Class Members are heirs or representatives of an estate of a person employed by American Greeting Corp., between 1989 and 1994.		
5-31-2013	09-CV-0509	(N.D. Cal.)	Robert Curry v. Hansen Medical, Inc. Plaintiff alleges that during the Class Period, Hansen's stock price was artificially inflated as a result of a series of untrue or materially misleading statements concerning Hansen's improper revenue recognition and accounting irregularities as disclosed by Hansen's restatement of several quarters of financial results. Plaintiffs further contend that the Settling Defendants made these statements knowing them to be false or misleading, or recklessly disregarding their false or misleading natures, and investors suffered injury as a result of the alleged inflation. Class Members are all persons or entities who purchased or otherwise acquired the publicly traded common stock of Hansen between 2-19-2008 and 10-18-2009, inclusive, and were allegedly damaged thereby.	6-20-2013	For more information write, call or visit: Lionel Z. Glancy Glancy Binkow & Goldberg LLP 1925 Century Park East Suite 2100 LosAngeles, CA 90067 1 888 773-9224 <u>settlement@glancylaw.c</u> Om