|  **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **6-1-2018** | **17-CV-095** | **(W.D.N.C.)** | **Ella Matthews, et al. v. TCL Communications, Inc., et al.**This Supplemental Notice is being provided because the proposed detailed notice to class members, did not include deadlines for class members to opt-out, (6-29-18) or exclude themselves from the class action settlement, or the date of the final approval hearing. For more information please see CAFA Notice Dated 3-2-2018. | **8-8-2018** | **For more information write to:****Nicholas A. Migliaccio****Migliaccio & Rathod LLP****412 H Street, N.E.****Suite 302****Washington, DC 20002** |
| **6-1-2018** | **17-CV-03736** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Winifred J. Daugherty, et al. v. The University of Chicago**The lawsuit alleges that the University violated the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”) with respect to the Plans. Plaintiffs claim that the University should not have selected and maintained the College Retirement Equities Fund Stock Account and TIAA Real Estate Account as investment options in the Plans, and that the Plans paid higher recordkeeping and administrative fees than necessary to the Plans’ record-keepers. Plaintiffs also previously claimed that loans made under the participant loan-program constituted prohibited transactions under ERISA, but the court dismissed that claim. | **9-12-2018**Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more information write to:****John J. Nestico****SCHNEIDER WALLACE COTTRELL** **KONECKY WOTKYNS, LLP****8501 N. Scottsdale Road****Suite 270****Scottsdale, AZ 85253****Todd Collins****Ellen Noteware****BERGER & MONTAGUE P.C.****1622 Locust Street****Philadelphia, PA 19103****Mark Richard Miller****WEXLER WALLACE LLP****55 W. Monroe Street****#3300****Chicago, IL 60603** |
| **6-1-2018** | **16-CV-05387** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Parsons v. Kimpton Hotel & Restaurant Group, LLC**The lawsuit claims that Kimpton was responsible for the Security Incident that occurred and asserts claims such as: breach of implied contract, negligence, and unlawful and unfair conduct under the California Unfair Competition Law. The lawsuit seeks compensation for people who had losses as a result of the Security Incident. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write to:****John A. Yanchunis****Morgan & Morgan Complex** **Litigation Group****One Tampa City Center****201 N. Franklin Street****7th Floor****Tampa, FL 33602** |
| **6-4-2018** | **10-CV-00990** | **(D. DE)** | **In re: Wilmington Trust Securities Litigation****Re Defendants: Wilmington Trust Corp., J.P. Morgan Securities LLC, Keefe, Bruyette & Woods, Inc., David R. Gibson, V.A. Harra, Jr., William North, Kevyn N. Rakowski, Ted T. Cecala, Carolyn S. Burger, R. Keith Elliott, Donald E. Foley, Gailen Krug, Stacey J. Mobley, Michael M. Rollins, Oliver R. Sockwell, Robert W. Tunnell, Jr., Susan D. Whiting, Rex L. Mears, and Louis Freeh**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the SecuritiesExchange Act of 1934 and Section 11 of the Securities Act of 1933. Among other things, the Action alleges that, during the Class Period, the Wilmington Trust Defendants engaged in a broad conspiracy to fraudulently conceal Wilmington Trust’s true financial condition by representing to the investing public that Wilmington Trust managed risk conservatively. Specifically, Lead Plaintiffs allege that, among other things, unbeknownst to investors, (i) the Bank’s senior executives manipulated the loan loss reserve by concealing hundreds of millions of dollars in the past due and nonperforming loans; (ii) the Bank’s senior executives fraudulently extended $1.74 billion of matured and past due loans; (iii) the Bank regularly engaged in fraudulent underwriting practices by lending money in violation of the Bank’s underwriting policies; (iv) the Bank’s officers fraudulently manipulated the Bank’s asset review process by understaffing and overriding the credit risk function; and (v) in 2009, the Federal Reserve issued a Memorandum of Understanding identifying these fundamental failures at the Bank. Lead Plaintiffs allege that Defendants misled the investing public by fraudulently concealing Wilmington Trust’s true financial condition and lending practices, which caused Class Members to purchase their stock at artificially inflated prices, and suffer damages when the truth was revealed before the stock market opened on 11-1-2010. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Bernstein Litowitz Berger &** **Grossmann LLP****Hannah Ross****1251 Avenue of the Americas****44th Floor****New York, NY 10020****Saxena White P.A.****Joseph E. White, III****150 E. Palmetto Park Road Suite 600****Boca Raton, FL 33432** |
| **6-4-2018** | **10-CV-00990** | **(D. DE.)** | **In re: Wilmington Trust Securities Litigation**For more information see CAFA Notice above. | **Not set yet** | **For more information see above.** |
| **6-4-2018** | **17-CV-02193** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Dean Sheikh, et al. v. Tesla, Inc. d/b/a Tesla Motors, Inc.**The lawsuit alleges, among other things, that Tesla did not release Enhanced Autopilot features with capabilities that corresponded to the schedule it had previously indicated to its customers. While Tesla acknowledges that it took longer than it initially expected to roll out these features, and it has thus agreed to a settlement, it strongly denies any claim of wrongful conduct. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.autopilotsettlement.com**](http://www.autopilotsettlement.com) |
| **6-10-2018** | **13-CV-01180** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Jan Harrison, et al. v. DuPont, et al.****Re Defendants: E.I. DuPont DeNemours and Company; Huntsman International LLC; Kronos Worldwide, Inc.; and Cristal USA Inc., formerly known as Millennium Inorganic Chemicals Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants violated the antitrust laws by conspiring to fix, raise, maintain, and stabilize the price of titanium dioxide in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C., and various states antitrust, unfair competition, unjust enrichment, and consumer protection laws. | **8-16-2018** | **For more information write or visit:****BARRETT LAW GROUP, P.A.****Don Barrett** **P.O. Box 927****404 Court Square****Lexington, MS 39095**[**www.TitaniumPaintSettlement.com**](http://www.TitaniumPaintSettlement.com) |
| **6-11-2018** | **13-CV-03073** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: MyFord Touch Consumer(“MFT”) Litigation**The case concerns certain model year 2010-2013 Ford and Lincoln vehicles (“Class Vehicles”). The lawsuit alleges defects in the in-vehicle information and entertainment systems called MyFord Touch or MyLincoln Touch (“MFT”). Plaintiffs allege that when the system freezes or crashes the driver cannot operate any of the features connected to MFT, including the navigation technology, the radio, the rearview camera, or the defroster. Plaintiffs further allege that Ford charged a premium price for MFT and seek to recover economic damages. Plaintiffs are not pursuing claims for personal injuries. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****STEVE W. BERMAN****CATHERINE Y.N. GANNON****CRAIG SPIEGEL****HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL**  **SHAPIRO LLP****1918 Eighth Avenue****Suite 3300****Seattle, Washington 98101****206 623-7292 (Ph.)****steve@hbsslaw.com****catherineg@hbsslaw.com****craigs@hbsslaw.com** |
| **6-11-2018** | **16-CV-551****17-CV-1093** | **(S.D. Ohio)** | **Alma Bojorquez, et al. v. Abercrombie and Fitch Co., et al.**District Court moved the final approval hearing from 7-25-2018, for more information see CAFA Notice dated 4-18-2018. | **9-12-2018** | **For more information write to:****Randall B. Aiman-Smith****Reed W. L. Marcy****Hallie Von Rock****Carey S. James****Aiman-Smith & Marcy****7677 Oakport Street****Suite 1150****Oakland, CA 94621** |
| **6-11-2018** | **13-CV-02203** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Fuel Injection Systems Cases (End-Payor Plaintiffs’ Action)****Re Defendants: Keihin Corporation and Keihin North America, Inc. (collectively, “Keihin”)** End-Payor Plaintiffs (“EPPs”) allege that Keihin “engaged in a long running conspiracy to unlawfully fix, artificially raise, maintain and/or stabilize prices, rig bids for, and allocate the market and customers in the United States for Fuel Injection Systems.”  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Cotchett, Pitre, &**  **McCarthy LLP****San Francisco Airport**  **Ofice Center****840 Malcolm Road****Burlingame, CA 94010** |
| **6-13-2018** | **16-CV-08898** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Dolins v. Continental Casualty Company; Continental Assurance Company; CNA Financial Corporation; Investment Committee of the CNA 401(K) Plus Plan; Northern Trust Company; And Does 1 through 10**Plaintiff filed a class action complaint in this Court against Defendants alleging violations of ERISA, the federal law governing retirement plans. The complaint is on behalf of a proposed class of participants in and beneficiaries of the Plan, who had invested some or all of their Plan Accounts in the CNA Fixed Income Fund. Until 12-31-2011, the CNA Fixed Income Fund was invested in large part through a contract between the Plan and Continental Assurance Company that guaranteed that the rate of interest credited on the funds invested under that contract would never drop below 4% per year (net 3.88% after expenses). The complaint alleges that the decision of those who were responsible for choosing the Plan’s investment options (“the Plan fiduciaries”) to cancel this contract was a violation of those fiduciaries’ duties to the Plan’s participants and harmed the Plaintiff and the class members. After the cancelation of this contract, the CNA Fixed Income Fund has earned a lower rate of return on its assets than before the cancelation. | **9-20-2018** | **For more information write or fax:****Jeffrey Lewis****Erin Riley****Alison Gaffney****Keller Rohrback L.L.P.****1201 Third Avenue****Suite 3200****206 623-3384 (Fax)** |
| **6-13-2018** | **17-CV-03950** | **(E.D. PA.)** | **Andrea Arrington, et al. v. Optimum Healthcare IT, LLC**This lawsuit alleges that Settlement Class Members were not paid overtime compensation during the Class Period, because they are alleged to have been misclassified as independent contractors.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Shanon J. Carson****Sarah R. Schalman-Bergen****Eric Lechtzin****Berger & Montague, P.C.****1622 Locust Street****Philadelphia, PA 19103****215 875-3033 (Ph.)** |
| **6-13-2018** | **12-CV-4727** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Scotts EZ Seed Litigation****Re Defendants: The Scotts Miracle-Gro Company and The Scotts Company LLC** This lawsuit alleges advertising, warranty, contract, and unjust enrichment claims contending that EZ Seed® does not grow grass “50% Thicker With Half The Water\* \*Versus ordinary seed when each was watered at half the recommended rate.  | **12-19-2018** | **For more inforamtion visit or call:**[**www.GrassSeedSettlement.com**](http://www.GrassSeedSettlement.com)**.****1 844 271-4786 (Ph.)** |
| **6-14-2018** | **15-CV-01831** | **(N.D. Ala.)** | **Harold McWhorter 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 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 to:****D. Frank Davis****John E. Norris****Wesley W. Barnett****Davis & Norris LLP****The Bradshaw House****2154 Highland Ave., South****Birmingham, AL 35205** |
| **6-14-2018** | **16-CV-03282** | **(C.D. Ill.)** | **Mary Holcomb, et al. v. Hospital Sisters Health System****Re Defendants: Health System and Hospital Sisters Health System Retirement Committee (“Defendants”)**The Complaint alleges that Defendants denied ERISA protections to the participants and beneficiaries of the Plan, a defined benefit pension plan sponsored by HSHS, by incorrectly claiming that the Plan qualifies as an ERISA-exempt “church plan.” The Complaint further alleges that asserting this exemption caused Defendants to deny Plan Participants the protections of ERISA. These included, among other violations: underfunding the Plan by over $514 million, offering eligible participants lump sum distribution values that are less than what they should have been if the lump sums had been calculated in accordance with ERISA, and failing to furnish Plaintiffs or any member of the class with required statements and reports. The Complaint also alleged that the church plan exemption, as applied to HSHS, violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment and lodged alternative claims for breach of contract, promissory estoppel, unjust enrichment, and breach of fiduciary duty pursuant to state law. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Lynn Lincoln Sarko****Laura R. Gerber****Allison Gaffney****Keller Rohrback L.L.P.****1201 Third Avenue****Suite 3200****Seattle, WA 98101****Karen L. Handorf****Michelle C. Yau****Cohen Milstein Sellers &**  **Toll PLLC****1100 New York Ave., N.W.****Suite 500 West****Washington, DC 20005** |
| **6-14-2018** | **16-CV-07534****16-CV-07969** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Brown v. Dynamic Recovery Solutions, LLC****Brown v. Autovest, LLC** The Lawsuit alleged that collection letters, sent on behalf of Autovest that offered to resolve auto retail installment or lease debts without disclosure of the fact that the statute of limitations (the period in which a lawsuit may be filed) had allegedly expired, violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, (“FDCPA”), 15 U.S.C. §1692 et al. | **10-1-2018** | **For more information write to:****Edelman, Combs, Latturner** **& Goodwin, LLC****20 S. Clark Street****Suite 1500****Chicago, IL 60603** |
| **6-14-2018** | **12-MD-02311****13-CV-02702** | **(M.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Air Conditioning Systems (End Payor Plaintiffs’)****Re Defendants: Sanden Automotive Components Corporation, Sanden Automotive Climate Systems Corporation, and Sanden International a (U.S.A.) Inc. (“Sanden”)**Each lawsuit claims that the Defendants in that lawsuit agreed to unlawfully raise the price of a certain kind of vehicle component part. (For example, one lawsuit is called In re: Radiators and the affected product are radiators). As a result of the alleged agreements by Defendants, consumers and businesses that purchased or leased qualifying new vehicles (not for resale) containing those parts or who indirectly purchased qualifying replacement parts (not for resale) from the Defendants may have paid more than they should have. Although the Round 3 Settling Defendants have agreed to settle, they do not agree that they engaged in any wrongdoing or are liable or owe any money or benefits to Plaintiffs. The Court has not yet decided who is right. | **8-1-3028** | **For more information visit, call or write:**[**www.AutoPartsClass.com**](http://www.AutoPartsClass.com)**1 877 940-5043 (Ph.)****Auto Parts Settlements****P.O. Box 10163****Dublin, OH 43017-3163** |
| **6-15-2018** | **12-MD-02311****13-CV-02702** | **(M.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Air Conditioning Systems (Automobile Dealership Action)****Re Defendants: Sanden Automotive Components Corporation, Sanden Automotive Climate Systems Corporation, and Sanden International a(U.S.A.) Inc. (“Sanden”)**For more information please see CAFA Notice above. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit, call or write:**[**www.AutoPartsClass.com**](http://www.AutoPartsClass.com)**1 877 940-5043 (Ph.)****Auto Parts Settlements****P.O. Box 10163****Dublin, OH 43017-3163** |
| **6-15-2018** | **17-CV-03400** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Banerjee, et al. v. Avinger, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Jeffrey M. Soniski, John B. Simpson, Matthew B. Ferguson, Donald A. Lucas, James B. McElwee, James G. Cullen, and Thomas J. Fogarty (the “Individual Defendants”), Canaccord Genuity Inc., Cowen and Company, LLC, Oppenheimer & Co. Inc., BTIG, LLC, and Stephens Inc. (the “Underwriter Defendants”) (together with Avinger and Individual Defendants, the “Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated §11 of the Securities Act of 1933 (“1933 Act”)and §10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) by making materialmisstatements and omissions concerning Avinger’s business and the testing and design of its Pantheris Atherectomy product in connection with Avinger’s 1-30-2015 Initial Public Offering (“IPO”) and thereafter, which caused the price of Avinger common stock to be artificially inflated during the Class Period; and that Class Members suffered damages when the truth about the Pantheris product was ultimately revealed to the market. | **10-23-2018** | **For more information write to:****Scott+Scott Attorneys** **at Law LLP****William C. Fredericks****The Helmsley Building****230 Park Avenue****17th Floor****New York, N.Y. 10169-1820** |
| **6-16-2018** | **16-CV-03703** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Exhaust Systems (End-Payor Actions)****Re Defendants: Tenneco Inc., Tenneco GmbH, Bosal Benelux NV, Bosal Industries-Georgia, Inc., Eberspächer Exhaust Technology GmBH & Co. KG and Eberspächer North America Inc., Faurecia Sa, Faurecia Emissions Control Technologies, USA, LLC and Meritor, Inc. (collectively “Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that named and unnamed co-conspirators, manufacturers and/or suppliers of Exhaust Systems globally and in the United States, for engaging in a long-running conspiracy to unlawfully fix, artificially raise, maintain and/or stabilize prices, rig bids for, and allocate the market and customers in the United States for Exhaust Systems. According to the United States Department of Justice, Defendants’ conspiracy successfully targeted the long-struggling United States automotive industry, raising prices for car manufacturers and consumers alike.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Cotchett, Pitre, &**  **MCarthy LLP****San Francisco Airport** **Office Center****840 Malcolm Road****Suite 200****Burlingame, CA 94010****Robins Kaplan LLP****399 Park Avenue****Suite 3600****New York, NY 10022****Susman Godfrey L.L.P.****1900 Avenue of the Stars****Suite 1400****Los Angeles, CA 90067** |
| **6-20-2018** | **16-CV-04196** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Alessandro Berni, Guiseppe Santochirico, Massimo, Simioli, and Domenico Salvati v. Barilla G.eR. Fratelli S.p.A. and Barilla American, Inc. d/b/a Barilla USA**This lawsuit involves claims that Barilla violated certain consumer protection statutes and state common law through the use of non-functional slack-fill in their specialty pasta boxes (collectively, the “Products”). Specifically, the lawsuit maintains that consumers were not aware of the amount of the pasta contained in the boxes.  | **12-17-2018** | **For more information visit, call or write:**[**WWW.BARILLACLASSACTION.COM**](http://WWW.BARILLACLASSACTION.COM)**1877 659-9728 (Ph.)****Robert I. Harwood****Harwood Feffer LLP****712 Fifth Avenue****New York, NY 11021** |
| **6-20-2018** | **17-CV-02166** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Charlotte Bulgajewski v. R.T.G. Furniture Corporation**Plaintiff alleges that RTG procured background checks on job applicants using a disclosure form that was not in the format required by the Fair Credit Reporting Act. For that reason, Plaintiff contends that the background checks at issue were not properly authorized. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Marc R. Edelman****Morgan & Morgan****One Tampa City Center****201 N. Franklin Street****7th Floor****Tampa, FL 33602** |
| **6-22-2018** | **15-CV-04003** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Kevin Knox, et al. v. Yingli**Plaintiffs allege that Defendant violated the federal securities laws by making false and misleading statements to the investing public as set out in the Complaint. Specifically, the Complaint alleges that during the Class Period, Defendant failed to inform investors that the Chinese solar subsidy program that it relied upon, Golden Sun, faced likely termination due to widespread fraud. The Complaint further alleges that one of Yingli’s largest customers, Shanghai Chaori Solar Energy Science & Technology Company, Ltd., among others, could not pay its bills due to Yingli, requiring Yingli to recognize millions of dollars in bad debts, which it did not do. The Court dismissed the Litigation, and Plaintiffs filed an appeal. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Laurence M. Rosen****THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.****355 South Grand Avenue Suite 2450****Los Angeles, CA 90071** |
| **6-22-2018** | **16-CV-10635** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **Carolyn Perlin v. Time Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated Michigan’s Video Rental Privacy Act, M.C.L. §445.1712 (“VRPA”) by disclosing information related to its customers’ magazine subscriptions to third parties. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Ari J. Scharg****Edelson PC****350 North LaSalle Street****Suite 1400****Chicago, Ill 60654** |
| **6-22-2018** | **16-CV-01369** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Feist, et al. v. Petco Animal Supplies, Inc.**The Action alleges that Petco violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act (“FCRA”), 15 U.S.C. §1681, et seq. in two ways. First, Plaintiffs allege that Petco violated the FCRA by procuring consumer reports on Plaintiffs and class members for employment purposes without providing a proper stand-alone disclosure, and without obtaining proper authorization, as required by FCRA. These individuals are “Disclosure Class Members.” It is estimated that there are approximately 37,279 Disclosure Class Members on whom Petco procured consumer reports during the Class Period, which is defined as the period from 5-1-2014 through 12-31-2015. Second, Plaintiffs allege that Petco failed to provide a required pre-adverse action notification letter to a small number of Disclosure Class Members against whom it took an adverse action on the basis of information contained within a consumer report. These individuals are “Adverse Action Class Members.” It is estimated that approximately 52 of the Disclosure Class Members are also Adverse Action Class Members.  | **11-19-2018** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Mark S. Greenstone****Glancy Prongay &** **Murray LLP****1925 Century Park East****Suite 2100****Los Angeles, CA 90067****888 773-9224 (Ph.)****310 201-9160 (Fax)** |
| **6-22-2018** | **15-CV-9188** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Merryman, et al. v. JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.**Plaintiffs assert claims for breach of contract, breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing and conversion. As noted above, Plaintiffs allege that during the relevant time period, JPM, as depositary bank for the issuance of ADRs, systematically deducted impermissible fees from dividends and/or cash distributions issued by foreign companies, and owned to ADR holders. More specifically, as Plaintiffs allege, JPM assigned FX 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 FX rate JPM actually received at the time of the conversion. As a result of its practice of adding a spread to FX rates, Plaintiffs allege that JPM 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** |
| **6-22-2018** | **15-CV-03562** | **(D. MD.)** | **Nallagonda v. Osiris Therapeutics, Inc., Lode Debrabandere, Gregory I. Law and Philip R. Jacoby, Jr.**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants made false and misleading statements and omissions regarding the revenue and revenue recognition practices at Osiris during the period 5-14-2014, and 11-16-2015. The Lead Plaintiff alleges that Defendants made materially false statements, and deceptively omitted material facts, as a consequence of Defendants’ alleged efforts to artificially inflate the Company’s reported revenues and mislead Osiris’s shareholders and the public as to Osiris’s revenue and revenue growth. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write, call, fax or e-mail:****Hagens Berman Sobol &**  **Shapiro LLP****Attn: Peter Borkon****715 Hearst Avenue****Suite 202****Berkeley, CA 94710****510 725-3000 (Ph.)****510 725-3001 (Fax)****peteb@hbsslaw.com** |
| **6-22-2018** | **16-MD-2687** | **(D.N.J.)** | **In re: Liquid Aluminum Sulfate Antitrust Litigation**The Direct Purchaser Class Plaintiffs claim that the GEO Settling Parties participated in a conspiracy – with other Defendants in the Action and unnamed co-conspirators – to allocate territories and/or not to compete for each other’s historical business by rigging bids, allocating customers and fixing, stabilizing, and maintaining the price of Alum sold in the United States from 1-1-1997 to at least 2-28-2011 in violation of the federal antitrust laws. The Direct Purchaser Class Plaintiffs allege that the claimed anticompetitive conduct resulted in artificially inflated prices for Alum.  | **11-14-2018** | **For more information write or visit:****James E. Cecchi****Carella, Byrne, Cecchi,** **Olstein, Brody &**  **Agnello, P.C.****5 Becker Farm Road****Roseland, NJ 07068**[**www.liquidaluminumdirectsettlement.com**](http://www.liquidaluminumdirectsettlement.com) |
| **6-22-2018** | **11-CV-00289** | **(D. Vt.)** | **Lampers, et al. v. Green Mountain Coffee Roasters, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Keurig Green Mountain, Inc., f/k/a Green Mountain Coffee Roasters, Inc. (“Green Mountain”); and Gravel and Shea, on behalf of Lawrence J. Blanford and Frances G. Rathke (collectively, the “Defendants”)** Plaintiffs allege that Defendants misrepresented Green Mountain as a company that was straining capacity and struggling to build enough inventories to satisfy demand for its products. Plaintiffs allege, however, that Defendants knew or should have known that the Company was, in fact, experiencing serious problems with inventory controls and concerns about ballooning inventory levels. It is further alleged that the truth was finally revealed following the close of the market on 11-9-2011, when Green Mountain announced that inventories had increased 156% year-over-year and that the Company had missed sales expectations for the first time in 15 quarters. Plaintiffs also allege that Green Mountain’s stock price declined nearly 39%, from $67.02 per share to $40.89 per share, in response to this news. | **10-22-2018** | **For more information write or visit:****Bernstein Litowitz Berger &**  **Grossmann LLP****John C. Browne****1251 Avenue of the Americas****44th Floor****New York, NY 10020**[**www.greenmountainsecuritieslitigation.com**](http://www.greenmountainsecuritieslitigation.com) |
| **6-22-2018** | **14-CV-00548** | **(S.D. Tex.)** | **In re: Conn’s, Inc. Securities Litigation****Re Defendants: Michael J. Poppe, and Theodore M. Wright (collectively “Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the federal securities laws by making materially false and misleading statements and omitting material information concerning Conn’s loosening of lending policies and underwriting standards, contrary to assurances to investors, which exposed the Company to high amounts of bad debt and increased collections risks. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Motley Rice LLC****James M. Hughes****28 Bridgeside Blvd.****Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464****Scott+Scott Attorneys at**  **Law LLP****Deborah Clark-Weintraub****The Helmsley Building****230 Park Ave****17th Floor****New York, NY 10169** |
| **6-25-2018** | **16-CV-00631** | **(S.D. Iowa)** | **Audino, et al. v. JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.**This lawsuit alleges that Chase breached the promissory notes underlying the class’s FHA-insured home loans when it collected post-payment interest (i.e., interest for the remainder of the month during which the loan was paid off) without providing a certain form of disclosure to borrowers who made a pre-payment inquiry request for payoff figures or tender of prepayment. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Ashlea G. Schwarz****Paul LLP****601 Walnut Street Suite 300****Kansas City, MO 64106****816 984-8100 (Ph.)** |
| **6-25-2018** | **14-CV-22069** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Robert A. Schreiber v. Ally Financial Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that Ally violated the legal rights of consumers by charging or permitting dealerships to charge impermissible documentary or dealer fees in connection with lease end vehicle purchase pursuant to purchase option provisions in consumers’ leases.  | **10-11-2018** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Matthew P. Weinshall** **PODHURST ORSECK, P.A.** **SunTrust International** **Center** **One S.E. 3rd Ave****Suite 2700** **Miami, Florida 33131****305 358-2800 (Ph.)****305 358-2382 (Fax)** |
| **6-25-2018** | **16-CV-00189** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Veda Woodard, et al. v. Lee Labrada, et al.****Re Defendants: Labrada Bodybuilding Nutrition, Inc.; Labrada Nutritional Systems, Inc.; Dr. Mehmet C. Oz, M.D.; Entertainment Media Venture, Inc.; Naturex, Inc.; and Interhealth Nutraceuticals, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege violation of certain California Consumer Protection laws alleging causes of action for (1) fraud and deceit; (2) Negligent Misrepresentation; (3) Quasi-Contract/Unjust Enrichment; (4) Violations of California’s Unfair Competition Law, Cal Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.; (5) Violations of California’s Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750 et seq.; (6) Violations of California’s False Advertising Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500 et seq.; (7) Breach of Express Warranty, Cal. Comm. Code § 2313; and, (8) Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability, Cal. Comm. Code § 2314. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Timothy D. Cohelan****Cohelan Khoury &**  **Singer****605 C St Suite 200****San Diego, Ca 92101** |
| **6-26-2018** | **17-CV-11297** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Bazerman, et al. v. American Airlines, Inc.**This Case alleges that between 7-13-2013 and [Settlement Date] (“Case Timeframe”) American incorrectly charged certain customers baggage fees, breaching American’s contract with these customers. When customers buy tickets from American for air travel, a contract is formed in which American promises certain customers that they can check a certain number of their bags at no additional charge, depending on route of travel, cabin of service, frequent flyer status or other reasons. This case alleges that during the Case Timeframe, American breached its contract with certain customers by charging them to check one or more of their bags despite promises that they could do so at no additional cost. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Linda M. Dardarian****Byron Goldstein****Raymond Wendell****Goldstein, Borgen,**  **Dardarian & Ho****300 Lakeside Drive Suite 1000****Oakland, Ca 94612****510 763-9800 (Ph.)****AAcheckedbags@gbdhlegal.com** |
| **6-27-2018** | **16-CV-443** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Preman, et al. v. Pollo Operations, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that Pollo Operations, Inc. violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act. The parties have agreed to settle all claims about advertising text messages Defendant allegedly caused to be delivered to the Settlement Class without adequate consent. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****John Yanchunis****Morgan & Morgan****201 N. Franklin Street****7th Floor****Tampa, FL 33602** |
| **6-27-2018** | **12-CV-10544** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Mansor, et al. v. J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.**The lawsuit claims that Chase aided and abetted a Ponzi scheme run primarily byWilliam Wise through companies affiliated with Wise, including Millennium Bank, UnitedTrust of Switzerland and Sterling IS. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit or write:**[**https://millenniumbankreceivership.tklaw.com**](https://millenniumbankreceivership.tklaw.com)**Harley S. Tropin****Tal J. Lifshitz****Kozyak Tropin Throckmorton,**  **LLP****2525 Ponce de Leon****9th Floor****Miami, FL 33134** |
| **6-27-2018** | **14-CV-2657** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Roseman, et al. v. Bloomberg L.P.**The lawsuit claims that defendant Bloomberg violated California state law by failing to pay Analytics Representative for any hours worked over forty in a pay week and failing to pay overtime wages. The lawsuit seeks unpaid overtime wages, plus liquidated damages, prejudgment interest, attorney’s fees and other costs. | **10-26-2018** | **For more information write, call or visit:****Getman, Sweeney & Dunn, PLLC****260 Fair Street****Kingston, NY 12401****845 255-9370 (Ph.)**[**www.getmansweeney.com**](http://www.getmansweeney.com) |
| **6-27-2018** | **17-CV-52271** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Escobar, et al. v. Pret A Manger (USA) Limited**Plaintiffs allege that Pret violated the Fair Labor Standards Act and the New York Labor Law by failing to pay non-exempt (hourly) employees in New York shops for all the hours they worked, including overtime for hours over forty in a workweek, and by failing to provide accurate wage statements and wage notices, among other claims. Plaintiffs seek to recover unpaid wages and other back pay, liquidated damages and penalties, injunctive relief and attorneys’ fees and costs. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Lee Litigation Group, PLLC****C.K. Lee****Anne Seelig****30 East 39th Street****Second Floor****New York, NY 10016****212 455-1188 (Ph.)****212 465-1181 (Fax.)** |
| **6-29-2018** | **14-CV-7126** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Alaska Electrical Pension Fund, et al. v Bank of America, et al.**The lawsuit alleges that the Defendants, including the Newly Settling Defendants, engaged in anticompetitive acts that affected the market ISDAfix Instruments in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. The lawsuit also alleges that the Defendants were unjustly enriched under common law and breached ISDA Master Agreements. The lawsuit was brought by, and on behalf of, persons who transacted in ISDAfix Instruments. | **11-8-2018** | **For more information write, call or visit:****Daniel L. Brockett****Quinn Emanuel Urquhart &**  **Sullivan, LLP****51 Madison Avenue****22nd Floor****New York, NY 10010****1 844 789-6862 (Ph.)**[**www.ISDAfixAntitrustSettlement.com**](http://www.ISDAfixAntitrustSettlement.com) |
| **6-29-2018** | **17-CV-1160** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **Denise Baker v. Navient Solutions, LLC Inc., (NSL)**Plaintiff alleges that NSL violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq., in making subsequent calls to cellular telephone because the dialing technology constitutes an automatic telephone dialing system, within the meaning of the TCPA, and NSL did not have the requisite prior express consent to call. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****William L. Downing****Consumer Legal** **Solutions, PC****1071 Bay Breeze Drive****Suffolk, VA 23435** |
| **6-29-2018** | **17-CV-0093** | **(E.D. Wash.)** | **Valerie Rhodes v. Wells Fargo Bank, National Association, A National Banking Association**Plaintiff alleges that Wells Fargo, without authorization, entered upon Plaintiff’s property for the purpose of changing locks, performing winterization, or remove items from the property before completing a foreclosure sale in violation of Washington law. Plaintiff also alleges that Wells Fargo wrongfully charged property owners or for others, fees for actions taken. |  | **For more information write to:****Clay M. Gatens****Devon A. Gray****Jeffers, Danielson,** **Sonn & Aylward, P.S.****2600 Chester Kimm Road****P.O. Box 1688****Wenatchee, WA 98807** |