|  **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **8-1-2018** | **12-MD-02311****15-CV-00707****15-CV-14096****15-CV-01107****15-CV-01007****15-CV-14097** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Alternators****Rush Truck Alternators/Starters****In re: Starters****In re: Radiators****Rush Truck Radiators**The lawsuit claims that the Defendants agreed to unlawfully raise the price of certain motor vehicle Starters, Alternators, or Radiators. As a result, dealers of Trucks and/or Equipment who purchased for resale or lease Trucks and/or Equipment containing those parts or who indirectly purchased those parts as separate parts, which were manufactured or sold by a Defendant or any subsidiary, affiliate, or alleged co-conspirator of a Defendant, are alleged to have paid more than they should have. | **9-26-2018** | **For more inforamtion visit:**[**www.TruckDealerSettlement.com**](http://www.TruckDealerSettlement.com) |
| **8-1-2018** | **12-MD-02311****15-CV-11829****15-CV-02301** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation** **Power Window Motors****In re: Power Widow Motors (Direct Purchase Action)****Re Defendants: Mitsuba Corporation and American Mitsuba Corporation (together, “Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants participated in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for Power Window Motors in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act. | **Not set yet**Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more information write or call:****Eugene A. Spector****William G. Caldes****Jonathan M. Jagher****SPECTOR ROSEMAN &** **KODROFF, P.C.****1818 Market St.****Suite 2500****Philadelphia, PA 19103****215 496-0300 (Ph.)** |
| **8-1-2018** | **15-CV-00711** | **(D. Del.)** | **Hurwitz v. Mullins, et al.****Re Defendants: Scott W. Smith, Richard A. Roberts, W. Richard Anderson, Bruce W. McCullough, and Loren Singletary (the “VNR Defendants) and Eric Mullins, Charles W. Adcock, Jonathan C. Farber, Townes G. Pressler, Jr. John A. Bailey, and Jonathan P. Carroll (the “LRE Defendants” and collectively with the VNR Defendants, the “Defendants”)**Class Representative filed a class action complaint on behalf of the public unitholders of LRE against the LRE Defendants, Vanguard, and Lighthouse Merger Sub, LLC ("Lighthouse Merger Sub"), asserting violations of sections 14(a) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act"), and U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") Rule 14a-9 promulgated thereunder, in connection with the acquisition of LRE by Vanguard and Lighthouse Merger Sub that was first announced on 4-20-2015 (the "Acquisition").  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Stephen J. Oddo****ROBBINS ARROYO LLP****600 B Street****Suite 1900****San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **8-2-2018** | **12-CV-5822****12-CV-6693** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Green Pond Road Associates, LLC v. Bank of America, et al.****Courtyard at Amwell II, LLC et al. v. Bank of America Corp., et al.** Plaintiffs allege antitrust violations in connection with HSBC’s and other banks’ USD LIBOR submissions during the 8-1-2007 through 5-31-2010 class period (the “Class Period”). The Actions were brought by Non-Defendant OTC Plaintiffs on behalf of putative class who transacted in certain USD LIBOR-linked instruments during the Class Period.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****William H. London****Freed Kanner London &** **Millen LLC****2201 Waukegan Road****Suite 130****Bannockburn, Illinois 60015****224 632-4504 (Ph.)** |
| **8-2-2018** | **16-CV-00504** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Holly Attia, et al. v. The Neiman Marcus Group LLC**The Lawsuit claims that the Neiman Marcus Group (“NMG”) failed to: properly pay commissioned retail employees all hourly and overtime wages earned; pay at least minimum wage for all hours worked; provide compliant meal or rest breaks or compensation in lieu of those breaks; pay all wages due at the termination of employment; reimburse business expenses; and provide accurate itemized wage statements. Plaintiffs also allege that NMG violated the Unfair Competition Law and contend that they and the aggrieved employees are entitled to recover penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code § 2698 et seq. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****JAMES HAWKINS PLC****James Hawkins/Malte Farnaes/** **Christina Lucio****9880 Research Drive****Suite 200****Irvine, California 92618****949-387-7200 (Ph.)** |
| **8-3-2018** | **12-MD-02311****15-CV-00707****15-CV-01107****15-CV-14096** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Hitachi Automotive Systems, Ltd. (“HIAMS”), Hitachi Automotive Systems Americas, Inc. and Hitachi, Ltd. (collectively, “HIAMS Defendants”)** Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of HIAMS Defendants’ alleged participation in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for Alternators or Starters in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act and various state antitrust, unfair completion, unjust enrichment, and consumer protection laws as set forth in Plaintiffs’ First Amended Class Action Complaint in the Action (the “Complaint”). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Wayne A. Mack****J. Manly Parks****Duane Morris LLP****30 S. 17th Street****Philadelphia, PA 19103****215 979-1000 (Ph.)****215 979-1020 (Fax)** |
| **8-3-2018** | **11-MD-2262** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: LIBOR-Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: HSBVC Bank plc (together with HSBC Holdings plc, “HSBC”); Deutsche Bank Aktiengesellschaft (“Deutsche Bank”); Barclays Bank plc (“Barclays”) and Citibank N.A. and Citigroup Inc. (together, “Citibank”)**Plaintiff alleges that the banks manipulated the U.S. Dollar LIBOR rate during the financial crisis, artificially lowering the rate for their own benefit. Plaintiffs claim that the Defendants manipulated the U.S. Dollar LIBOR rate, and that, as a result, purchasers did not receive as much in interest payments for their U.S. Dollar LIBOR-based instruments from the banks as they should have.  | **10-25-2018** | **For more information call or visit:****1-888- 568-7640 (Ph.)** [**WWW.BARCLAYSLIBORSETTLEMENT.COM**](http://WWW.BARCLAYSLIBORSETTLEMENT.COM) |
| **8-3-2018** | **17-CV-00637** | **(D.N.H.)** | **Bauman v. FoodState, Inc.**This Lawsuit is about the claims made on the labeling and packaging of vitamin supplements manufactured and sold by FoodState. Plaintiffs allege that the labeling, packaging, and websites for products manufactured by FoodState and/or its affiliates or co-manufacturers, including vitamin supplements sold under the MegaFoods and Innate Response Formula brands were misleading violate consumer protection laws. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Abbas Kazerounian****Kazerouni Law Group, APC****245 Fischer Avenue****Suite D1****Costa Mesa, CA 92626****Joshua B. Swigart****HYDE & SWIGART****2221 Camino Del Rio South Suite 101****San Diego, CA 92108-3551** |
| **8-3-2018** | **16-CV-04644** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Albert Talone, D.O., et al. v. The American Osteopathic Association**The lawsuit challenges the American Osteopathic Associations (“AOA’s”) policy that holders of an AOA Board certification and alleges members of a sub-class were harmed by allegedly fraudulent statements or intentional omissions made by the AOA regarding the AOA’s Osteopathic Continuous Certification program and the requirement that holders of “lifetime” Board certification purchase membership in the AOA to maintain their “lifetime” certificates.  | **11-9-2018** | **For more information visit:**[**www.cafanotices.com/Talone-v-AOA\_6210**](http://www.cafanotices.com/Talone-v-AOA_6210) |
| **8-6-2018** | **11-CV-04321** | **(W.D. Mo.)** | **Barfield, et al. v. Sho-Me Power Electric****Re Defendants: Sho-Me Power Electric Cooperative (“Sho-Me Power”) and Sho-Me Technologies, LLC (“Sho-Me Tech”) (collectively, “the Sho-Me Defendants”)**The lawsuit claims two electric cooperative (the Sho-Me Defendants and KAMO Electric Cooperative and its subsidiary, K-PowerNet, LLC) exceeded the scope of easements granted for electric-transmission lines. Plaintiffs previously reached a Settlement with KAMO. The issue in this lawsuit is whether the Sho-Me Defendants needed to obtain new easements (besides the written electric easements they already had) from landowners to permit them to use the fiber-optic cables for commercial telecommunications.  | **11-15-2018** | **For more inforation write to:****Heidi Doerhoff Vollet****Cook Vetter, Doerhoff &** **Landwehr, P.C.****231 Madison Street****Jefferson City, MO 65101****Kathleen C. Kauffman****Ackerson Kauffman Fex, P.C.****1701 K Street, NW****Suite 1050****Washington, DC 20006** |
| **8-6-2018** | **12-CV-00401** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation** **In re: Heater Control Panels)**Plaintiff alleges that that Denso engaged in a conspiracy to suppress and eliminate competition by agreeing to fix, maintain, or stabilize prices, rig bids and allocate the supply of Heater Control Panels sold in the United States. Plaintiff further alleged that as a result of the conspiracy, it and other direct purchasers of Heater Control Panels were injured by paying more than they would have paid in the absence of the alleged illegal conduct. In 2013, Plaintiff filed an Amended Class Action Complaint naming Sumitomo and Tokai Rika as additional defendants. In 2017, Plaintiff filed a separate Class Action Complaint, naming the Alps defendants.Sumitomo, Alps and Tokai Rika all deny Plaintiff’s allegations and liability, and have asserted defenses to Plaintiff’s claims. | **11-8-2018** | **For more inforation write or call:****Steven A. Kanner****FREED KANNER LONDON**  **& MILLEN LLC****2201 Waukegan Road****Suite 130****Bannockburn, IL 60015****224 632-4500 (Ph.)****Joseph C. Kohn****KOHN, SWIFT & GRAF, P.C.****1600 Market Street****Suite 2500****Philadelphia, PA 19103****215 238-1700 (Ph.)** |
| **8-7-2018** | **17-CV-01365** | **(D. Del.)** | **Bray, et al. v. GameStop Corp.**The lawsuit claims that GameStop was responsible for the Security Incident that occurred and asserts claims such as: negligence, negligence per se, breach of contract, breach of implied contract, unjust enrichment and violation of the Indiana and North Carolina consumer protection statutes. The lawsuit seeks compensation for people who had losses as a result of the Security Incident. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Benjamin F. Johns****Chimicles & Tikellis LLP****361 W. Lancaster Avenue****Haverford, PA 19041** |
| **8-10-2018** | **16-CV-01036** | **(W.D. Mo.)** | **David Stagner, et al. v. Hulcher Services, Inc.**Former/current employees (“Plaintiffs”) sued Hulcher in a lawsuit, claiming that Division Managers, Division Managers in Training, Assistant Division Managers in Training, which includes ADMXs throughout this Notice and its related settlement documents, (collectively “Manager Subclass”), Operators, Apprentice Operators, and Laborers (collectively “Non-Manager Subclass”) (The subclasses are subparts of the below Rule 23 Class and Collective Class, which are collectively the “Settlement Classes”) were not properly compensated pursuant to state and federal wage and hour laws and common law and/or were misclassified and, as a result, were not paid for all hours worked at the legal and proper rates and/or that improper reductions were made to their pay. Plaintiffs brought these claims pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”) and state wage and hour and common laws for all states in which members of the Settlement Classes worked and/or where Hulcher conducted business.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Matthew E. Osman****Osman & Smay LLP****8500 W. 110th Street Suite 330****Overland Park, KS 66210****Sean M. McGivern****Graybill & Hazlewood, LLC****218 N. Mosley Street****Wichita, KS 67202** |
| **8-10-2018** | **16-CV-05479** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Hefler v. Wells Fargoi & Company, et al.****Re Defendants: Wells Fargo & Company (“Wells Fargo”), John G. Stumpf, John R. Shrewsberry, Carrie L. Tolstedt, Timothy J. Sloan, David M. Carroll, David Julian, Hope A. Hardison, Michael J. Loughlin, Avid Modjtabai, James M. Strother, John D. Baker II, John S Chen, Lloyd H. Dean, Elizabeth A. Duke, Susan E. Engel, Enrique Hernandez, Jr., Donald M. James, Cynthia H. Milligan, Federico F. Peña, James H. Quigley, Judith M. Runstad, Stephen W. Sanger, Susan G. Swenson, and Suzanne M. Vautrinot (collectively, the “Individual Defendants,” and together with Wells Fargo, the “Settling Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that Wells Fargo and certain of the Individual Defendants made misrepresentations and omissions about a core element of Wells Fargo’s business, its “cross-selling” business model, and that certain of the Individual Defendants personally profited by selling Wells Fargo common stock from 2-26-2014 through 9-20-2016, inclusive (the “Class Period”) while in possession of adverse, material non-public information, in violation of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder. | **9-6-2018** | **For more information write or e-mail:****Bernstein Litowitz Berger &**  **Grossmann LLP****Salvatore J. Graziano****1251 Avenue of the Americas****44th Floor****New York, NY 10020****settlements@blbglaw.com** |
| **8-10-2018** | **14-CV-02066** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Michael J. Angley v. UTi Worldwide Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Edward G. Feitzinger, Eric W. Kirchner, and Richard G. Rodick (collectively, “Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that UTi and three of its former executive officers, violated Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities ExchangeAct of 1934 by materially misrepresenting the functionality and effectiveness of UTi’s new operating systems and significant problems caused by the new systems. Plaintiffs allege that these materially false or misleading statements created artificial inflation in the price of UTi common stock during the period 3-28-2013 through 2-25-2014, inclusive. Plaintiffs allege that the truth was revealed to the market on 2-26-2014 when UTi disclosed that its liquidity and capital resources had decreased significantly over the previous several quarters, primarily the result of four factors, including “recent invoicing delays, primarily in the U.S., in connection with implementing [UTi’s] new freight forwarding operating system and global financial system.” The price of UTi common stock dropped by 30% that day. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****William B. Federman****A. Brooke Murphy****FEDERMAN & SHERWOOD****10205 N. Pennsylvania Ave.****Oklahoma City, OK 73120****405 235-1560 (Ph.)****405 239-2112 (Fax)** |
| **8-13-2018** | **16-CV-01069** | **(W.D. Wash.)** | **In re: Juno Therapeutics Inc.****Re Defendants: Hans E. Bishop, Steven D. Harr and Mark J. Gilbert (collectively “Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants related to an immunotherapy cancer treatment candidate under development by Juno known as JCAR015, which focuses on the use of chimeric antigen receptor cells to treat a rare form of blood cancer called Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia. Plaintiffs alleged that, during the Class Period, Juno’s stock price was artificially inflated as a result of a series of allegedly untrue or materially misleading statements regarding JCAR015. Plaintiffs further contended that Defendants made these statements knowing them to be false or misleading, or recklessly disregarded their false or misleading natures, and further alleged that investors suffered injury as a result of the alleged inflation when the truth was disclosed. | **11-16-2018** | **For more information write to:****Leigh Handelman Smollar****Pomerantz LLP****Ten South La Salle Street****Suite 3505****Chicago, IL 60603** |
| **8-13-2018** | **9-CV-00430** | **(E.D. Cal.)** | **Carlin, et al. v. DairyAmerica, Inc. and California Dairies, Inc.**The lawsuit claims that California Dairies and DairyAmerica unlawfully conspired to misreport data regarding sales of nonfat dry milk to the USDA during the period January 2002 through April 2007. The USDA used the figures misreported by Defendants to calculate minimum raw Grade A milk prices, which were paid to dairy farmers whose raw Grade A milk was pooled on a Federal Milk Marketing Order. The lawsuit claims that California Dairies and DairyAmerica intentionally misreported the nonfat dry milk sales data in order to depress raw milk prices that were paid to dairy farmers. The lawsuit seeks to recover damages incurred by dairy farmers as a result of the unlawful suppression of prices of raw Grade A milk during the period January 2002 through April 2007. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.cafanotices.com/Carlin-et-al-v-DairyAmerica-Inc**](http://www.cafanotices.com/Carlin-et-al-v-DairyAmerica-Inc) |
| **8-14-2018** | **12-MD-02311****12-CV-00401****17-CV-11109** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****(In re: Heater Control Panel Cases) (Direct Purchaser Actions)****Re Defendants: Tokai Rika Co., Lgtd. And TRAM, Inc., a/k/a Tokai Rika U.S.A. Inc. (collectively, “Tokai Rika”)**Plaintiffs allege that Denso engaged in a conspiracy to suppress and eliminate competition by agreeing to fix, maintain, or stabilize prices, rig bids and allocate the supply of Heater Control Panels sold in the United States. Plaintiff further alleged that as a result of the conspiracy, it and other direct purchasers of Heater Control Panels were injured by paying more than they would have paid in the absence of the alleged illegal conduct. In 2013, Plaintiff filed an Amended Class Action Complaint naming Sumitomo and Tokai Rika as additional defendants. In 2017, Plaintiff filed a separate Class Action Complaint, naming the Alps defendants. | **11-8-2018** | **For more information write or call:****Steven A. Kanner****FREED KANNER LONDON** **& MILLEN LLC****2201 Waukegan Road****Suite 130****Bannockburn, IL 60015****224 632-4500 (Ph.)****Joseph C. Kohn****KOHN, SWIFT & GRAF, P.C.****1600 Market Street****Suite 2500****Philadelphia, PA 19103****215 238-1700 (Ph.)** |
| **8-14-2018** | **12-MD-02311****12-CV-00402****12-CV-00602****13-CV-01302****13-CV-01602** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation** **(In re: Heater Control Panels, Occupant Safety Systems, Switches and Steering Angle Sensors Cases) (Automobile Dealership Actions)****Re Defendants: Tokai Rika Co., Ltd. And TRAM, Inc., a/k/a Tokai Rika U.S.A. Inc. (collectively, “Tokai Rika”)**These actions arise from an alleged conspiracy among some of the automotive industry’s largest manufacturers, marketers, and sellers of Automotive Parts, including Heater Control Panels, Occupant Safety Restraint Systems, Switches, and Steering Angle Sensors, to fix the prices, rig bids, and allocate the market and customers in the United States for such products.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****BARRETT LAW GROUP, P.A.****P.O. Box 927****404 Court Square****Lexington, MS 39095****CUNEO GILBERT & LaDUCA,**  **LLP****Suite 200****4725 Wisconsin Avenue, NW****Washington, DC 20016** |
| **8-14-2018** | **17-CV-960** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **Snyder v. Holy Redeemer Health System, Inc., et al.**Plaintiffs alleged that Defendant violated Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”) by improperly claiming that the Plan qualified as a Church Plan exempt from ERISA regulation. Plaintiffs asserted causes of action for Defendant’s alleged denial of ERISA protections to the Plan participants and beneficiaries. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Gerald D. Wells, III****2200 Renaissance Boulevard****Suite 275****King of Prussia, PA 19406****610 822-3700 (Ph.)****610 822-3800 (Fax)** |
| **8-14-2018** | **15-CV-01831** | **(N.D. Ala.)** | **Harold McWhorter, et al. v. Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC**Plaintiffs allege that Ocwen violated Section 1692f(1) of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (“FDCPA”) by charging fees to borrowers for making loan payments by telephone, through IVR, or through IVR, or through the internet (“Convenience Fees”). During the period at issue in this lawsuit, Ocwen used Western Union’s “Speedpay™” service to facilitate these kinds of payments, so the Convenience Fees charged by Ocwen were often referred to as “Speedpay” fees. Plaintiffs contend that such fees were unlawful because they were not expressly authorized by the Settlement Class Members’ underlying loan documents.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****D. Frabnk Davis****John E. Norris****Weswley W. Barnett****Davis & Norris LLP****The Bradshaw House****2154 Highland Avenue****South Birmingham, AL 35205****202 930-9900 (Ph.)** |
| **8-15-2018** | **14-CV-03964** | **(M.D. Pa.)** | **Daniel B. Storm v. Paytime, Inc.**This lawsuit claims that Defendant failed to adequately protect individuals’ information from unauthorized access. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Gary F. Lynch****Carlson Lynch Sweet Kilpela**  **& Carpenter, LLP****1133 Penn Ave., 5th Floor****Pittsburgh, PA 15222****412 322-9243 (Ph.)****412 231-0246 (Fax)** |
| **8-17-2018** | **17-CV-03577** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Akari Therapeutics PLC Securities Litigation****Re Defendants: Akari Therapeutics, PLC, Dov Elefant and Ray Prudo, Gur Roshwalb (together with Akari, Elefant and Prudo, “Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants engaged in a plan, scheme, conspiracy and course of conduct, pursuant to which they knowingly or recklessly engaged in acts, transactions, practices and courses of business which operated as a fraud and deceit upon Plaintiffs and the other members of the Class; made various untrue statements of material facts and omitted to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; and employed devices, schemes and artifices to defraud in connection with the purchase and sale of securities. Such scheme was intended to, and, throughout the Class Period, did: (i) deceive the investing public, including Plaintiffs and other Class members, as alleged herein; (ii) artificially inflate and maintain the market price of Akari securities; and (iii) cause Plaintiffs and other members of the Class to purchase or otherwise acquire Akari securities and options at artificially inflated prices. In furtherance of this unlawful scheme, plan and course of conduct, defendants, and each of them, took the actions set forth herein. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.****Phillip Kim****Laurence M. Rosen****275 Madison Avenue****34th Floor****New York, New York 10016****212 686-1060 (Ph.)****212 202-3827 (Fax)****pkim@rosenlegal.com****lrosen@rosenlegal.com****Leah Heifetz****101 Greenwood Avenue****Suite 440****Jenkintown, PA 19046****215 600-2817 (PH.)****212 202-3827 (Fax)****lheifetz@rosenlegal.com** |
| **8-17-2018** | **18-CV-21820** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Bloom v. Jenny Craig, Inc.**The lawsuit alleges that Jenny Craig sent text messages to Plaintiff’s wireless telephone number without prior express written consent in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C., § 227 (“TCPA”) and seeks actual and statutory damages under the TCPA on behalf of the named Plaintiff and a class of all individuals in the United States. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Scott Edelsberg****Edelsberg Law, PA****19495 Biscayne Blvd.****#607****Aventura FL 33180** |
| **8-17-2018** | **13-CV-00701****15-CV-11828****15-CV-13634****13-CV-01401****15-CV-11830****13-CV-01101****14-CV-10674****13-CV-01101****13-CV-02501****17-CV-13158** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **Alternators****All European Auto Supply, Inc. v. Denso Corp.****Irving Levine Automotive Distributors, Inc. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al.****Ignition Coils****All European Auto Supply, Inc. v. Denso Corp.****Starters****Tiffin Motor Home, Inc. v. Denso Corporation, et al.****In re: Starters relating to Direct Purchaser Action****Valve Timing Control Devices****All European Auto Supply, Inc. v. Aisin Seiki Co. Ltd., et al.**Plaintiffs allege they were injured as a result of Defendants participation in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for Automotive Parts in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, as set forth in Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' Complaints. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Freed Kanner London & Millen LLC****2201 Waukegan Road****Suyite 130****Bannockburn, IL 60015****Preti, Flaherty, Beliveau & Pachios LLP****One City Center****P.O. Box 9546****Portland, ME 04101****Kohn, Swift & Graf,** **P.C.****One South Broad Street****Suite 2100****Philadelphia, PA 19107** |
| **8-17-2018** | **14-CV-001197****14-CV-00591** | **(M.D. Pa.)** | **The Suessenbach Family Limited Partnership, et al. v. Access Midstream Partners L.P.****Brown v. Access Midstream Partners, L.P., et al.Re Defendants: Chesapeake Energy Corporation (“Chesapeake”), Access Midstream Partners, L.P. (now known as The Williams Companies, Inc.) AND Domenic J. Dell’Osso, Jr.**Plaintiffs claim that Chesapeake underpaid Royalties relating to gas produced inNortheastern Pennsylvania by deducting inflated Post-Production Costs from royalties. (Post-Production Costs are costs for gathering, compressing, transporting, or dehydrating gas, which are incurred before the interconnect point of a Transmission Pipeline. Post-Production Costs do not include transportation costs incurred after gas has entered the interconnect point of a Transmission Pipeline, which is a large-diameter natural gas transmission or transportation pipeline). Plaintiffs allege that Chesapeake and Access engaged in a purported scheme to charge landowners artificially inflated and supra-competitive rates for certain postproduction services, among other allegations. Plaintiffs sought a declaration that Chesapeake and Access had behaved unlawfully, and also sought monetary damages and interest. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Noah Axler****Axler Goldich, LLC****1520 Locust St.****Suite 301****Philadelphia, PA 19102** |
| **8-17-2018** | **16-CV-00613** | **(W.D. Pa.)** | **Adam C. Kasab, Yechiel Peter Schwartz, Thomas Wheeler and Valerie Olson, et al. v. Francis D. John, Theodore D. Baum, Peter Hopper, Melvin Heller, Steve Hooper, Salvatore Tirabassi, Munish Sood and Nicholas Massard** Plaintiffs have asserted that, among other things, Defendants violated various laws and disregarded certain alleged fiduciary duties owed to the Class Members. Specifically, Plaintiffs claim that Defendants improperly breached those duties and unlawfully dissuaded the Class from participating in the new share issue in order to keep the equity value of United Network Services, Inc., to themselves. | **9-17-2018** | **For more information write or call:****Scott M. Hare****1806 Frick Building****437 Grant Street****Pitsburgh, PA 15219****412 338-8632 (Ph.)** |
| **8-17-2018** | **17-CV-2018** | **(E.D. Okla.)** | **Ruth Ann McNeill v. Citation Oil & Gas Corp.**The Litigation seeks damages for Defendant’s alleged failure to pay statutory interest on allegedly late payments under Oklahoma law.  | **1-14-2019** | **For more information visit:**[**www.citation-settlement.com**](http://www.citation-settlement.com) |
| **8-20-2018** | **17-CV-01990** | **(D. Colo.)** | **Elna Sefcovic, LLC, Juhan, LP, and Roy Royalty, Inc. v. TEP Rocky Mountain, LLC**Plaintiffs allege that Defendant TEP has failed to properly pay royalties to Plaintiff Sefcovic and the members of Subclass I by: (1) failing to pay royalties based upon first commercial market prices for residue gas which was sold to third party purchasers after it was placed into a marketable condition, less only a reasonable transportation cost deduction; and (2) failing to pay royalties based upon first commercial market prices for marketable natural gas liquid products, after such natural gas liquid products are fractionated into marketable natural gas liquids, such as ethane, propane, butane, iso-butane, and natural gasoline, less only a reasonable transportation cost deduction to the point of sale. | **11-20-2018** | **For more inforamtion write call or fax:****Stacy A. Burrows, Co.** **George A. Barton, Mo.** **Law Offices of George A.** **Barton, P.C.****7227 Metcalf Ave.****Suite 301****Overland Park, KS 66204****816 300-6250 (Ph.)****816 300-6259 (Fax)** |
| **8-20-2018** | **17-CV-01624** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Aboltin v. Jeunesse, LLC, et al.****Re Defendants: Wendy R. Lewis, Ogale “Randy” Ray, Scott A. Lewis, Kim Hui, and Kevin Giguere**The lawsuit claimed that Jeunesse Global and the other Defendants engaged in unfair business practices that lured people into paying for a business opportunity that the Defendants knew was rigged against the new distributors. Jeunesse and the Defendants deny they did anything wrong. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Jonathan S. Batchelor****Jonathan Batchelor, PLC,** **200 W Portland Street #524****Phoenix, AZ 85003** |
| **8-20-2018** | **12-MD-02311****13-CV-00701****13-CV-01101****13-CV-02501****13-CV-01401** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Hitachi Automotive Systems, Ltd. (“HIAMS”), Hitachi Automotive Systems Americas, Inc., and Hitachi, Ltd. (collectively, “HIAMS Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of HIAMS Defendants’ participation in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for Alternators, Starters, Valve Timing Control Devices, and Ignition Coils sold in the United States from 1-1-2000 to 3-12-2018, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, as set forth in Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs’ Consolidated Class Action Complaints. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****FREED KANNER LONDON &**  **MILLEN LLC****2201 Waukegan Road****Suite 130****Bannockburn, IL 60015****PRETI, FLAHERTY, BELIVEAU** **& PACHIOS LLP****One City Center****P.O. Box 9546****Portland, ME 04101****KOHN, SWIFT & GRAF, P.C.****One South Broad Street, Suite 2100****Philadelphia, PA 19107** |
| **8-22-2018** | **17-CV-11155** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Delarosa v. State Street Corporation****Re Defendants: Joseph L. Hooley, Edward J. Resch, and Michael W. Bell (the “Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the federal securities laws by allegedly making false and misleading statements to the investing public as set forth in the complaint. The complaint alleges that Defendants violated the federal securities laws by making false and misleading statements regarding the Company’s annual financial statements for fiscal years 2011 through 2015. The Action seeks money damages againstDefendants for violation of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. The Court has made no decision regarding the merits of the claims. The Settlement resolves all of the claims in the Action, as well as certain other claims or potential claims. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Laurence M. Rosen****THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.****275 Madison Avenue****34th Floor****New York, New York 10016****212 686-1060 (Ph.)****212 202-3827 (Fax)** |
| **8-23-2018** | **16-CV-03702** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Exhaust Systems (Automobile Dealership Actions)****Re Defendants: Tenneco Inc., Tenneco GMBZH, Tenneco Automotive Operating Co., Inc., Bosal Benelux NV, Bosal Industries-Georgia, Inc., Eberspächer Exhaust Technology GMBH &Co. KG and Eberspächer North America Inc., Faurecia SA Faurecia Emission Control Technologies, USA, LLC and Meritor, Inc.**The separate lawsuits claim that the Defendants in each lawsuit conspired to fix, maintain, and artificially raise the price of component parts at issue in each lawsuit. The lawsuits claim that, as a result of the relevant Defendants’ conduct, Dealers paid more than they should have for the parts at issue in that lawsuit and paid more for the new vehicles in which those parts are contained. The lawsuits also allege that Dealers were unable to pass on all of these increased costs to their customers. These cases are proceeding as class actions for monetary recovery for Dealers. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Barrett Law Group,P.A.****P.O. Box 927****404 Court Square****Lexington, MS 39095****Cuneo Gilbert & LaDuca, LLP****Suite 200****4725 Wisconsin Ave., N.W.****Washington, DC 20016** |
| **8-24-2018** | **15-CV-99892** | **(M.D.N.C.)** | **Barnhill v. FirstPoint, Inc., d/b/a FirstPoint Information Resources, and FirstPoint Collection Resources, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that FirstPoint Collection Resources, Inc. (“FirstPoint”) attempted to collect debts that were no longer valid because they had been discharged in bankruptcy. These debts were associated with several types of services including medical services. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:****Edward H. Maginnis****Karl S. Gwaltney****Maginnis Law, PLLC****4801 Glenwood Avenue Suite 310****Raleigh, NC 27612****Emaginnis@maginnislaw.com****Kgwaltney@maginnislaw.com** |
| **8-24-2018** | **15-CV-03820** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Resistors Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Kamaya Electric Co., Ltd., and Kamaya, Inc. (together, “Kamaya Defendants”), Walsin Technology Corporation and Walsin Technology Corporation, U.S.A. (together, “Walsin Defendants”), and Hokuriku Electric Industry Co., Ltd. and HDK America, Inc. (together, “HDK Defendants”)**The Plaintiff alleged that Settling Defendants participated in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, or stabilize the price of linear resistors at artificially high levels in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1 et seq. |  | **For more information write to:****HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL**  **SHAPIRO LLP****715 Hearst Avenue****Suite 202****Berkeley, CA 94710****COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS &** **TOLL PLLC****1100 New York Ave. NW Suite 500, West Tower****Washington, DC 20005** |
| **8-27-2018** | **14-CV-00175** | **(E.D. Wash.)** | **Zamora Jordan v. Nationstar Mortgage, LLC**Plaintiff and the Class allege that Nationstar Mortgage LLC, without authorization, entered upon Plaintiff's and Class Members' properties for the purpose of inspecting the property, changing locks, performing winterization and other maintenance, and posting notices before completing a foreclosure sale in violation of Washington law. They also allege that Nationstar Mortgage LLC wrongfully charged property owners fees for doing these things. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**http://www.nationstarmortgageclassaction.com**](http://www.nationstarmortgageclassaction.com) |
| **8-27-2018** | **17-CV-00308** | **(E.D. Okla.)** | **McKnight Realty Co., v. Bravo Arkoma, LLC and Bravo Natural Resources**The Litigation asserts that Bravo underpaid royalties by taking deductions for fees and expenses relating to the midstream post-production costs of gathering, compression, dehydration, treatment, processing, and marketing and used fuel from the Class Wells without paying royalty on the volume of gas so used from January 1, 2014 through May 31, 2018. | **12-21-2018** | **For more information write or visit:****Barbara Frankland****Scott Goodger****Ryan Hudson****Rex Sharp****REX A. SHARP, P.A.****5301 West 75th Street****Prairie Village, KS 66208****Reagan Bradford****Mark Lanier****THE LANIER LAW FIRM, P.C.****100 E. California Ave., Suite 200****Oklahoma City, OK 73104**[**www.bravosettlement.com**](http://www.bravosettlement.com) |
| **8-27-2018** | **18-CV-81101** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Clark, et al. v. Oasis Outsourcing Holdings Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Oasis Outsourcing Inc., Oasis Retirement Savings Plan Investment Committee, Debra Bathurst, Barbara Drames, and Terry Mayotte**Plaintiffs allege that during the Class Period, Defendants did not comply with Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”) by causing the Plan to pay excessive fees to Plan service providers, by not using payments received from the Plan for proper expenses, and by making available a set of target date funds (the “Lincoln TGDFs”) that were not selected solely for participants’ benefit or based on a prudent decision-making process. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Nichols Kaster PLLP****Attn: Oasis Retirement**  **Savings Plan Settlement****80 S. 8th Street****#4600****Minneapolis, MN 55402** |
| **8-27-2018** | **17-CV-3139** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Contant, et al. v. Bank of America Corp., et al.****Re Defendants: Citigroup Inc., Citibank, N.A. Citicorp, and Citigroup Global Markets Inc. (together, “Citi”)**Plaintiffs allege, among other things, that Citi and all other defendants conspired to fix, raise, maintain, or stabilize the prices of foreign currencies (“FX”) and foreign currency instruments over a period beginning at least as early as 12-1-2007 and continuing through at least 12-31-2013 in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Michael Dell’Angelo****Merrill G. Davidoff****Joshua T. Ripley** **BERGER & MONTAGUE, P.C.****1622 Locust Street****Philadelphia, PA 19103****215 875-3000 (Ph.)** |
| **8-27-2018** | **15-CV-1404** | **(D.D.C.)** | **In re: Domestic Airline Travel Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendant: American Airlines, Inc. (“American”)**Plaintiffs allege a conspiracy by the four largest commercial air passenger carriers in the United States (American Airlines, Inc; Delta Airlines, Inc.; Southwest Airlines Co.; and United Airline, Inc.) to fix, raise, maintain and/or stabilize prices for air passenger transportation services within the United States, it's territories and the District of Columbia in violation of Sections 1 and 3 of the Sherman Antitrust Act. It is alleged that this collusion was utilized to limit capacity on their respective airlines and inflate ticket prices. Plaintiffs allege that beginning in or around 2009, Defendants' airfares rose substantially compared to those of other domestic carriers, despite stagnant or decreasing demand and decreases in the cost of jet fuel. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:****Michael Hausfeld****Hausfeld LLP****1700 K Street, N.W.****Suite 650****Washington, DC 20006****mhausfeld@hausfeld.com** |
| **8-27-2018** | **15-CV-1404** | **(D.D.C.)** | **In re: Domestic Airline Travel Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendant: Southwest Airlines Co. (“Southwest”)**The lawsuit claims that the Defendants agreed to limit capacity on domestic flights. As a result, the lawsuit alleges that ticket purchasers may have paid artificially inflated prices. For more information see CAFA above. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Michael D. Hausfeld****Hausfeld, LLP****1700 K Street NW****Suite 650****Washington, DC 20006** |
| **8-28-2018** | **6-CV-00620** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **In re: Mushroom Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Giorgi Mushroom Co. and Giorgio Foods, Inc. (collectively “Giorgi”)**Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants conspired to fix the price of fresh agaricus mushrooms sold in the non-Western UnitedStates (i.e. east of the Rocky Mountains) between 1-4-2001 and 8-8-2005 in violation of the federal antitrust laws. Among other things, Plaintiffs contend that the Defendants agreed to pricing policies and written price lists that established the price at which Defendants and their affiliated distributors would sell to direct purchasers in each of the six regions that make up the non-Western United States. Plaintiffs further contend that Defendants engaged in a Supply Control Program designed to limit the supply of fresh agaricus mushrooms and increase their price. This Supply Control Program included the acquisition and/or lease of mushroom farms in order to transfer them subject to deed restrictions that prohibited the production of mushrooms on those properties.  | **9-24-2018** | **For more inforamtmion visit:**[**www.garwingerstein.com**](http://www.garwingerstein.com) |
| **8-29-2018** | **6-CV-00620** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **In re: Mushroom Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendant: Creekside Mushrooms, Ltd. (“Creekside”)**For more information see CAFA Notice above. | **9-24-2018** | **For more inforamtmion visit:**[**www.garwingerstein.com**](http://www.garwingerstein.com) |
| **8-29-2018** | **10-MD-92143** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Optical Disk Drive Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Toshiba Corporation and Toshiba Samsung Storage Technology Corporation (collectively, the “Settling Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that Settling Defendants participated in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, or stabilize the price of Optical Disk Drives at artificially high levels in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act and various state antitrust and consumer protection statutes. | **2-4-2019** | **For more information write to:****Shana E. Scarlett****Hagens Berman Sobol** **Shapiro LLP****715 Hearst Avenue****Suite 202****Berkeley, CA 94710****Steve W. Berman****Hagens Berman Sobol** **Shapiro LLP****1918 Eight Avenue****Suite 3300****Seattle, WA 98101** |
| **8-30-2018** | **15-CV-04030** | **(N.D. Tex.)** | **In re: United Development Funding IV Securities Litigation and Hay v. Greenlaw, et al.****Re Defendants: United Development Funding IV (“UDF IV”), United Development Funding Income Fund V (“UDF V”), UMT Services, Inc., UMTH General Services, L.P., UMTH Land Development L.P., UMT Holdings, L.P., UDF Holdings, L.P., UDFH General Services, L.P. and UDFH Land Development, L.P. (together, the “UDF Entities”), and Philip K. Marshall, J. Health Malone, and Steven J. Finkle (the “Independent Trustees”)** Plaintiffs allege that Defendants made statements that were false and/or misleading and/or omitted information that was needed to render certain statements not misleading in, among other places, the Company’s financial statements. Plaintiffs further allege that UDF IV and UDF V were operating Ponzi-like schemes. Two separate, but related cases are pending against UDF IV and UDF V in the Texas Court alleging violations of federal and Texas securities laws. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Glancy Prongay &**  **Murray LLP****Leanne Solish****1925 Century Park East Suite 2100****Los Angeles, CA 90067****Kehoe Law Firm, P.C.****Michael Yarnoff****Two Penn Center Plaza, Suite 1020****1500 JFK Boulevard****Philadelphia, PA 19102****RoscaLaw, LLP****Alan L. Rosca****23250 Chagrin Blvd.****Suite 100****Beachwood, OH 44122** |
| **8-30-2018** | **17-CV-05472** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Kaiser-Nyman v. First Choice Payment Solutions, G.P., d/b/a Sekure Merchant Solutions**Plaintiff alleges that from 7-26-2013 through 2-1-2018 Defendant violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) by making calls to cellular telephones through the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice. The class representative alleges that Defendant did not have the recipients’ permission to make these calls. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Alexander H. Burke****Daniel J. Marovitch****BURKE LAW OFFICES, LLC****155 N. Michigan Avenue****Suite 9020****Chicago, IL 60601****312 729-5288 (Ph.)****312 729-5289 (Fax)** |
| **8-30-2018** | **15-CV-09185** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Benjamin Michael Merryman, Amy Whitaker Merryman Trust, and B. Merryman and Marryman 4th Generation Remainder Trust v. Citigroup, Inc. Citibank, N.A. and Citigroup Global Markets Inc.**Plaintiffs allege breach of contract and breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing against Citibank, N.A. and claims for conversion against all of the Citi Defendants. As noted above, Named Plaintiffs alleged that during the relevant time period, Citibank, N.A., as depository bank for the issuance of ADRs, systematically deducted impermissible fees from dividends and/or cash distributions issued by foreign companies, and owed to ADR holders. More specifically, as Named Plaintiffs alleged, the Depositary assigned Conversion rates to the Conversion of non-U.S. dollar-based dividends and cash distributions by foreign companies, which reflected a spread that was added to the Conversion rate the Depositary actually received at the time of the conversion. As a result of its practice of adding a spread to Conversion rates, Named Plaintiffs alleged that the Depositary improperly retained millions of dollars from dividends and cash distributions owed and payable to the class. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Sharan Nirmul****Kessler Topaz Meltzer** **& Check, LLP****280 King of Prussia Road****Radnor, PA 19087** |
| **8-31-2018** | **14-CV-2327** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Marisela Herrera and Nicolas Acosta v. JFK Medical Center Limited Partnership d/b/a JFK Medical Center; Memorial Healthcare Group, Inc. d/b/a Memorial Hospital Jacksonville; and HCA Management Services, L.P.**Plaintiffs allege that hospitals affiliated with HCA Healthcare, Inc. in Florida charge unreasonable amounts to patients with Florida Personal Injury Protection Insurance (“Florida PIP Insurance”) for certain emergency room services. | **12-13-2018** | **For more information write or call:****Andrew N. Friedman****Douglas J. McNamara****Eric A. Kafka****Cohen Milstein Sellers &**  **Toll****1100 New York Avenue, N.W.****East Tower, 5th Floor****Washington, DC 20005****202 408-4600 (Ph.)** |
| **8-31-2018** | **16-CV-01100** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Anthony Oliver v. The Men’s Wearhouse, Inc.**This Action claims that The Men’s Wearhouse violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C § 227 (“TCPA”) by sending unauthorized text message advertisements to the Class. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Myles McGuire****Evan M. Meyers****Eugene Y. Turin****MCGUIRE LAW, P.C.****55 W. Wacker Drive****9th Floor****Chicago, Illinois 60601****312 893-7002 (Ph.)** |
| **8-31-2018** | **17-CV-00985** | **(W.D. Mo.)** | **Dean Barrett v. Selene Finance LP**Plaintiff claims that Selene violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), § 1681b(b)(3)(B), by obtaining consumer reports after the consumer received a bankruptcy discharge. Plaintiff sued Selene for allegedly willfully violating FCRA in the lawsuit identified above. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write to:****A.J. Stecklein****Michael H. Rapp****Stecklein & Rapp Chartered****748 Ann Avenue****Kansas City, Kansas 66101** |
| **8-31-2018** | **15-CV-01778** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Intuit Data Litigation**This lawsuit claimed that Intuit (the“Defendant” in this lawsuit and the operator of TurboTax) failed to adequately prevent the filing of these fraudulent tax returns. “Plaintiffs” in this lawsuit are six of the taxpayers whose identities were used by someone else to file fraudulent federal tax returns using TurboTax. | **2-7-2019** | **For more information write or e-mail:****Roger N. Heller****LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &****BERNSTEIN LLP****275 Battery Street****29th Floor****San Francisco, CA 94111****rheller@lchb.com** |