|  **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **10-1-2018** | **17-CV-10085** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Aude v. Kobe Steel, Ltd.**The Complaint alleged that Kobe and company officers Hiroya Kawasaki, Yoshinori Onoe, Akira Kaneko and Naoto Umehara (collectively, “Defendants”) violated Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and Securities and Exchanges Commission (“SEC”) Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, by making materially false and misleading statements and omissions regarding, among other things, the quality of Kobe’s products and integrity of its operations, and failing to disclose that Kobe had falsified data on many of the Company’s products including it aluminum, cooper and steel products; and sold products that failed quality control tests in violation of applicable laws and regulations. As a result of Defendants’ alleged false and misleading statements, and failure to disclose the material information, Kobe’s ADRs and ordinary shares traded at artificially inflated prices. | **2-21-2019** | **For more inforamtion visit:**[**www.kobesteelsecuritieslitigation.com**](http://www.kobesteelsecuritieslitigation.com) |
| **10-2-2018** | **18-CV-00144** | **(S.D. Iowa)** | **Swinton v. Square Trade, Inc.**The Complaint alleged that SquareTrade’s conduct violated Iowa’s Private Consumer Frauds Act, Iowa Code Chapter 714H, the Magnusson-Moss Warranty Act, 15 U.S.C. § 2301 et seq., and the common law prohibition against unjust enrichment. These claims were pleaded on behalf of the Named Plaintiff and three putative classes of persons who purchased a SquareTrade Protection Plan on Amazon. The Action sought, among other relief, damages, restitution, and disgorgement of profits, statutory damages, attorneys’ fees, and costs. | **Not set yet**Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Harley C. Erbe****ERBE LAW FIRM****2501 Grand Avenue****Des Moines, Iowa 50312****515 281-1460 (Ph.)****515 281-1474 (Fax)****erbelawfirm@aol.com** |
| **10-3-2018** | **16-CV-441** | **(S.D. Ohio)** | **In re: Mercy Health ERISA Litigation**The complaint alleged that Defendants denied the Plans’ participants and beneficiaries the protections of ERISA by claiming the Plans were “church plans” that were exempt from ERISA. On 8-11-2016, the case was consolidated with two other cases alleging substantially similar claims, and was restyled “In re: Mercy Health ERISA Litigation, Civil Action No. 1:16-CV-00441-SJD”. | **11-28-2018** | **For more information visit:**[**http://ikrlaw.com/file/mercy-health**](http://ikrlaw.com/file/mercy-health) |
| **10-4-2018** | **12-MD-02311****16-CV-3403****16-CV-03402** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****(Indirect Purchasers and Automobile Dealers Plaintiff)****Re Defendant: Green Tokai Co., Ltd. (“GTC”)**This lawsuit is brought as a proposed class action against Nishikawa Rubber Company (“Nishikawa”) and Nishikawa Standard Company (“NISCO”) (collectively “Defendants”) and unnamed co-conspirators, manufacturers and/or suppliers of automotive body sealing products (“Body Sealing”) 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 Body Sealing. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Jonathan W. Cuneo****Joel Davidow****Daniel Cohen****Victoria Romanenko****Yifei Li****CUNEO GILBERT & LaDUCA, LLP****4725 Wisconsin Avenue NW, Suite 200****Washington, DC 20016****202 789-3960 (Ph.)****jonc@cuneolaw.com****joel@cuneolaw.com****danielc@cuneolaw.com****vicky@cuneolaw.com****evelyn@cuneolaw.com** |
| **10-4-2018** | **15-CV-05340** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Slovin v. Sunrun Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Clean Energy Experts, LLC, a California limited liability company doing business as Solar America, and Does 1-5, inclusive**The lawsuit alleges that Defendants and/or others acting on their behalf and/or third parties generating leads for Defendants made marketing calls to consumers. The lawsuit alleges that the Defendants violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act because some consumers did not agree to receive these calls, or because the calls were made using prerecorded messages. | **Not set you** | **For more information write to:****David C. Parcie****Suzanne Havens Beckman****212 Marine Street****Suite 100****Santa Monica, CA 90405** |
| **10-5-2018** | **17-CV-02537** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Sunrun Inc. Securities Litigation****Re Defendants: Sunrun Inc., Lynn Michelle Jurich, and Robert Patrick Komin, Jr.**Lead Plaintiffs brought this Litigation as a securities class action against Sunrun and certain of its officers and directors (the “Individual Defendants,” and collectively with Sunrun, the “Defendants”). Lead Plaintiffs generally allege that Sunrun, a solar power company that sells and maintains residential solar energy systems in the United States, misled investors about one of its key operating metrics – the amount of electricity that the Company had contracted to sell each quarter – in violation of §§10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Jeremy A. Lieberman****POMERANTZ LLP****600 Third Avenue****Floor 20****New York, New York 10016****212 661-1100 (Ph.)****917 463-1044 (Fax)****jalieberman@pomlaw.com** |
| **10-9-2018** | **15-CV-04701** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Jose Jacobo, et al. v. Ross Stores, Inc.**The lawsuit alleges that Ross engaged in false or misleading price comparison advertising through the comparison prices on Ross price tags in its stores, between 6-20-2011 and (date of preliminary approval) in violation of various California laws that prohibit false advertising and unfair competition. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Law Office of****Christopher J. Morosoff** **77-735 California Drive****Palm Desert, CA 92211** |
| **10-9-2018** | **14-CV-03251** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Menaldi v. Och-Ziff Capital Management Group LLC, (“OZM”) et al.****Re Defendants: Daniel S. Och and Joel M. Frank (collectively, “Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that, during the Settlement Class Period, OZM’s stock price was artificially inflated as a result of a series of untrue or materially misleading statements which omitted to disclose that OZM was under investigation by the United States Securities Exchange Commission and the United States Department of Justice for potential violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. Plaintiffs further contend that Defendants failed to disclose the investigation knowing the omissions to be false or misleading, or recklessly disregarding their false or misleading natures, and that investors suffered injury as a result of the alleged inflation. | **1-16-2019** | **For more information write or call:****Patrick V. Dahlstrom****Pomerantz LLP****Ten South LaSalle Street****Suite 3505****Chicago, Illinois 60603****312 377-1181 (Ph.)****Laurence Rosen****The Rosen Law Firm, P.A.****275 Madison Avenue****34th Floor****New York, NY 10016****212 686-1060 (Ph.)** |
| **10-9-2018** | **17-CV-01154** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Fosbrink v. Area Wide Protective, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act (the “FCRA”), 15 U.S.C. §1681b(b)(2), because it did not make a clear and conspicuous disclosure in writing that a consumer report would be obtained for employment purposes, in a document that consisted solely of the disclosure. Plaintiff alleges that the authorization form that Defendant used included information in addition to that permitted by the law and, therefore, was not a disclosure that consisted solely of the disclosure. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Marc Reed Edelman****MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.****201 N. Franklin Street, #700****Tampa, FL 33602-5157****813-223-5505 (Ph.)****813-257-0572 (Fax)****medelman@forthepeople.com** |
| **10-9-2018** | **17-CV-02828** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Celadon Group Inc., Securities Litigation****Re Defendants: Paul A. Will, and Bobby L. Peavler**The Action arises out of Defendants’ allegedly false and misleading representations that concealed Celadon’s liabilities and deteriorating financial condition throughout the Class Period. Lead Plaintiffs allege that, as a result, Celadon’s publicly disseminated financial statements and statements to the market regarding its financial condition were materially false and misleading. When the market learned about Celadon’s alleged misstatements, the prices of Celadon’s shares dropped substantially. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Labaton Sucharow LLP****Carol C. Villegas****140 Broadway****New York, NY 10005** |
| **10-10-2018** | **17-CV-01479** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **M&M Hart Living Trust v. Global Eagle Entertainment, et al.**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants Global Eagle, David M. Davis, and Thomas E. Severson Jr. (“Defendants”) violated Sections 10(b) and Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act of 1934. According to Plaintiffs, Defendants violated these statutes by making false or misleading statements concerning Global Eagle’s acquisition of Emerging Markets Communications (“EMC”), the accounting for that acquisition and the status of Global Eagle’s integration with EMC, despite deficiencies in the Company’s internal controls over financial reporting which limited Defendants from knowing whether these statements were true. When this information became public,Plaintiffs allege that Global Eagle’s share price fell and shareholders were damaged. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Adam M. Apton****LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP****1101 30th Street NW****Washington, D.C. 20007** |
| **10-10-2018** | **17-CV-0666** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Mark Smith v. Specialized Loan Servicing LLC, et al.****Specialized Loan Servicing LLC (the “SLS”), American Security Insurance Company, Standard Guaranty Insurance Company, and Voyager Indemnity Insurance Company (collectively “the Assurant Defendants”)**This lawsuit involves lender-placed insurance (“LPI”), which is insurance (hazard, flood, floodgap, or wind-only) that is placed on a borrower’s property to protect the borrower and mortgage lender when the borrower’s insurance policy lapses, or when the borrower does not maintain a homeowner’s insurance policy that is acceptable to the mortgage lender. When an LPI Policy is placed pursuant to the borrower’s mortgage contract, SLS pays premiums to the LPI insurer who writes the policy, and then SLS charges the borrowers for those premiums. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Adam Moskowitz****The Moskowitz Law** **Firm, PLLC****2 Alhambra Plaza****Suite 601****Coral Gables, FL 33134** |
| **10-12-2018** | **9-CV-02104** | **(C.D. Ill.)** | **In re: IKO Roofing Shingles Products Liability Litigation****Re Defendants: IKO Manufacturing Inc., IKO Industries Inc., IKO Industries Ltd., IKO Midwest Inc., and IKO Production Inc. (collectively, “Defendants”)**Plaintiffs alleged that the Shingles are subject to cracking, curling, blistering, fish mouthing, clawing, discoloration, and breaking, and do not perform in accordance with user’s reasonable expectations. Plaintiffs also challenged the IKO Defendants’ warranty program.  | **1-16-2019** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Halunen & Associates****Attn: Clayton D. Halunen****1650 IDS Center****80 South Eighth Street****Minneapolis, MN 55402****612 605-4098 (Ph.)****612 605-4099 (Fax)** |
| **10-12-2018** | **16-ML-02693** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **In re: VIZIO Consumer Privacy Litigation****Re Defendants: Vizio, Inc. (“VIZIO”) VIZIO Holdings, Inc., VIZIO Inscape Technologies, LLC; and VIZIO Inscape Services, LLC (collectively “Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that VIZIO violated privacy laws and consumer-protection laws by collecting information about what was displayed on certain VIZIO Smart TVs from 2-1- 2014 and 2-6-2017 for sale to advertisers. This information is called Viewing Data. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Eric H. Gibbs****Andre M. Mura****Gibbs Law Group LLP****505 14th Street****Suite 1110****Oakland, CA 94061** |
| **10-15-2018** | **17-CV-01035** | **(N.D. Ga.)** | **In re: Arby’s Restaurant Group, Inc. Data Security Litigation, Consolidated Consumer Case**The lawsuit claims that Arby’s was responsible for the Data Breach and asserts claims such as: breach of implied contract, negligence, negligence per se, unjust enrichment, declaratory judgment, violation of the Georgia Fair Business Practices Act, O.C.G.A. § 10-1-390 et seq., violations of the Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act, C.G.S. §§ 42-110a et seq., violations of the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act, Fla. Stat. §§ 501.201 et seq., and violation of the Tennessee Consumer Protection, Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 47-18-101 et seq. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****John A. Yanchunis****Morgan & Morgan Complex** **Litigation Group****One Tampa City Center****201 N. Franklin Street****7th Floor****Tampa, FL 33602** |
| **10-17-2018** | **15-CV-01710** | **(W.D. Wash.)** | **Brett Burant v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company**The lawsuit alleges that State Farm had a policy and practice of denying, terminating or limiting PIP benefits based on a "maximum medical improvement" (MMI) standard that violated Washington state insurance regulation WAC 284-30-395. The lawsuit alleges that, byemploying the MMI standard, State Farm acted in bad faith, breached the terms of its autoinsurance policy, violated the Consumer Protection Act of Washington, and violated theInsurance Fair Conduct Act.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Tyler K. Firkins****Van Siclen, Stocks &**  **Firkins****721 45th St NE****Auburn, WA 98002****253 859-8899 (Ph.)****866 947-4646 (Fax)** |
| **10-18-2018** | **15-CV-09936** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Moreno, et al. v. Deutsche Bank Americas Holding Corp., et al.**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants failed to prudently and loyally manage the Plan’s investment lineup in the best interest of participants and beneficiaries, gave an improper preference to investment options managed by companies affiliated with thePlan’s sponsor (Deutsche Bank Americas Holding Corp.), and failed to prudently monitor thePlan’s recordkeeper. |  | **For more information write or e-mail:****Kai Richter****Paul Lukas** **NICHOLS KASTER, PLLP****4600 IDS Center****80 South 8th Street****Minneapolis, MN 55402****krichter@nka.com****Lukas@nka.com** |
| **10-19-2018** | **17-CV-04029** | **(D. Kan.)** | **Jin Nakamura v. Wells Fargo Bank National Association d/b/a Wells Fargo Dealer Services, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges, among other things, that between 1-1-2006, and 12-31-2017, Wells Fargo repossessed customers’ motor vehicles without a court order while the customers were in military service, in violation of the Service members Civil Relief Act, 50 U.S.C. §§ 3901, et seq., and numerous state consumer protection statutes. Plaintiff also alleges common law conversion, negligence, and credit defamation as alleged in Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint, and proposed Second Amended Complaint. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Rex A. Sharp****Rayan C. Hudson****Scott B. Goodger****Rex A. Sharp, P.A.****5301 W. 75th Street****Prairie Village, KS. 66208****Bryce B. Bell****Mark W. Schmitz****Bell Law Firm, LLC****2600 Grand Blvd., Suite 580****Kansas City, Missouri 64108** |
| **10-19-2018** | **17-MD-02807** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **In re: Sonic Corp. Customer Data Breach Litigation****Re Defendants: Sonic Corp., Sonic Industries Services Inc., Sonic Capital LLC, Sonic Franchising LLC, Sonic Industries LLC, and Sonic Restaurants, Inc.**The lawsuit claims that Sonic did not have adequate safeguards in place and should be held responsible for the Data Breach and asserts claims such as: breach of implied contract, negligence, negligence per se, unjust enrichment, and violations of numerous state consumer-protection and data breach statutes. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****William B. Federman****Federman & Sherwood****10205 N. Pennsylvania Ave.****Oklahoma City, OK 73120** |
| **10-19-2018** | **14-CV-3428** | **(S.D. Tex.)** | **In re: Cobalt International Energy, Inc. Securities Litigation****Re Defendants: The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. Riverstone Holdings LLC, FRC Founders Corporation (f/k/a First Reserve Corporation), ACM Ltd. (f/k/a KERN Partners Ltd.), and the Carlyle Group, L.P. (collectively, the “Sponsor Defendants”); Peter R. Coneway, Henry Cornell, Michael G. France, N. John Lancaster, Scott L. Lebovitz, Kenneth W. Moore, J. Hardy Murchison, Kenneth A. Pontarelli, and D. Jeff van Steenbergen (collectively, the Sponsor Designee Defendants”) and Goldman Sachs & Co. LLC (f/k/a Goldman, Sachs & Co.) (“GS&Co.,” and together with the Sponsor Defendants and the Sponsor Designee Defendants, the “Settling Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that during the Class Period and in the offering materials for the offerings of Cobalt Securities that occurred during the Class Period, Defendants mislead investors about Cobalt’s operations in Angola, including concerning its business partners in Angola and the quality of its oil wells in that country. The action further alleges that the Sponsor Defendants violated insider trading law by selling Cobalt common stock while in possession of material non-public information about Cobalt’s Angolan operations. The action further alleges that investors in Cobalt Securities suffered economic harm when the truth about the nature of Cobalt’s Angolan business partners and the quality of the oil wells was revealed through a series of disclosures. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write to:****Entwistle & Cappucci LLP****Andrew J. Entwistle****299 Park Avenue, 20th Floor****New York, NY 10171****Bernstein Litowitz Berger &**  **Grossmann LLP****David R. Stickney****12481 High Bluff Drive****Suite 300****San Diego, CA 92130-3582** |
| **10-19-2018** | **17-CV-1280** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Jenna Lloyd, et al. v. Navy Federal Credit Union**The lawsuit claims that Navy Federal breached its contract with member checking AccountHolders and improperly assessed and collected Overdraft Fees on certain transactions. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Hassan Zavareei****Andrea Gold****TYCKO & ZAVAREEI LLP****1828 L Street NW, Ste. 1000****Washington, DC 20036** |
| **10-19-2018** | **24-CV-03428** | **(S.D. Tex.)** | **International Energy, Inc. Securities Litigation****Re Defendants: Cobalt International Energy, Inc., Nader Tavakoli, Cobalt International Energy, Inc., et al., Joseph H. Bryant, James W. Farnsworth, Jack E. Golden, Jon A. Marshall, Myles W. Scoggins, William P. Utt, John P. Wilkirson, and Martin H. Young, Jr. (collectively, the “Cobalt Settling Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges, among other things, thatduring the Class Period and in the offering materials for the offerings of Cobalt Securities that occurred during the Class Period, Defendants misled investors about Cobalt’s operations in Angola, including concerning its business partners in Angola and the quality of its oil wells in that country. The action further alleges that investors in Cobalt Securities suffered economic harm when the truth about the nature of Cobalt’s Angolan business partners and the quality of the oil wells was revealed through a series of disclosures. (Also see page 10 above) | **2-13-2019** | **For more information visit:**[**www.CobaltSecuritiesLitigation.com**](http://www.CobaltSecuritiesLitigation.com) |
| **10-19-2018** | **17-CV-02086** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Jay Rabkin v. Lion Biotechnologies, Inc., et al.** **Re Defendants: Lion Biotechnologies, Inc., now known as Iovance Biotherapeutics, Inc. (“Lion”), Manish Singh, and Michael Handelman (together “Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that, during the Class Period, defendants artificially inflated the price of Lion’s common stock by arranging for the publication on investment websites of paid promotional articles designed to appear as unaffiliated investment advice from analysts/investors with no connection to the Company. Lead Plaintiff also alleges that defendants improperly failed to disclose Lion’s retention of the stock promotion firm Lidingo, which facilitated such publications, and actively hid those facts (and in so doing made a number of false and misleading statements to the investing public).  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Kessler Topaz Meltzer &**  **Check, LLP****Attn: Jennifer L. Joost****One Sansome Street****Suite 1850****San Francisco, CA 94104****415 400-3000 (Ph.)****415 400-3001 (Fax)****Email:** **jjoost@ktmc.com** |
| **10-19-2018** | **9-CV-03339** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Brown, et al. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that Walmart failed to provide cashiers with suitable seats while working at the front-end check stands at Walmart stores in California in violation of California Labor Code §1198 and §14(a) of Wage Order 7-2001. Based on this allegation, Plaintiff seeks civil penalties under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”), Cal. Lab. Code §2698 et seq. Civil penalties are determined based on the number of pay periods the Settlement Class Members were employed during the Class Period. | **2-14-2019** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Charles A. Jones****Kelly McInerney****Jones Law Firm****95858 Prototype Court****Suite B****Reno, Nevada 89521****775 853-6440 (Ph.)****775 853-6445 (Fax)** |
| **10-22-2018** | **16-CV-07717** | **(D.C.N.J.)** | **Pharmacies v. Macoven Pharmaceuticals LLC, Pernix Therapeutics Holdings, Inc., and John Does 1-10, et al.**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 (“TCPA”), et seq., by sending unsolicited advertisements via facsimile to Plaintiff and a nationwide class of individuals and entities. Defendants filed a Third-Party Complaint against Odyssey Services, Inc. seeking indemnification from Odyssey relating to a facsimile advertising campaign conducted on 12-3-2013 and Odyssey asserted counterclaims against Pernix arising from it agreement with Odyssey which was the subject of the Action. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Stern·Thomasson LLP****Philip D. Stern****Andrew T. Thomasson****150 Morris Avenue****2nd Floor****Springfield, NJ 07081****973 379-7500 (Ph.)****andrew@sternthomasson.com** |
| **10-24-2018** | **18-CV-00864** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **In re: Dealer Management Systems Antitrust Litigation** Plaintiffs allege that Reynolds and CDKconspired, in violation of federal antitrustlaws and certain state antitrust and consumer protection laws, to restrain and/or eliminate competition by charging Dealership Class Plaintiffs more than they should have in the markets for Dealer Management System (“DMS”) software services and for Data Integration Services (“DIS”) programs and services for extracting, formatting, integrating, and/or organizing data from DMSs. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Peggy J. Wedgworth****Milberg Tadler Phillips**  **Grossman LLP****One Pennsylvania Plaza****19th Floor****New York, NY 10119** |
| **10-26-2018** | **27-CV-10300** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Crane v. Sexy Hair Concepts, LLC (“SHC”)**Plaintiff's claim that SHC violated the Massachusetts Consumer Protection Act and was unjustly enriched by manufacturing, marketing, and selling certain shampoos and conditioners that were represented to be free of sulfates and/or salts but that may have contained sulfates and/or salts.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, visit or e-mail:****Edward F.Haber****Patrick J. Vallely****Shapiro Haber & Urmy LLP****Two Seaport Lane****Boston, MA 02210****617 439-3939 (Ph.)****ehaber@shulaw.com** |
| **10-26-2018** | **16-CV-02625** | **(D. Md.)** | **William Sponn, et al. v. Emergent BioSolutions Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Fuad El-Hibri, Daniel J. Abdun-Nabi, Robert G. Krtamer, and Adam R. Havey (“Individual Defendants”) (collectively, “Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated §§10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by, inter alia, issuing false and misleading statements or failing to disclose material adverse facts about the Company and its financial prospects. Specifically, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants made material misrepresentations and/or omissions to the investing public regarding the renewal of Emergent’s BioThrax procurement contract with the United States Government. ECF No. 23 at ¶¶42, 47, 83, 86-87, 89, 91, 93-94, 96, 98, 100, 102, 104. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants led the market to expect a renewed BioThrax contract calling for significantly increased doses compared to the contract in existence at the time, which called for 44.75 million doses over a five-year period. Id.Plaintiffs further allege that as a result of Defendants’ false and misleading statements and omissions, Emergent’s stock traded at artificially inflated prices during the Settlement Class Period. | **1-22-2019** | **For more information write to:****ROBBINS GELLER****RUDMAN & DOWD LLP****ELLEN GUSIKOFF STEWART****655 West Broadway****Suite 1900****San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **10-26-2018** | **17-CV-0667** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Barry Rickert, et al. v. Caliber Home Loans, Inc., et al.**The Plaintiffs have brought claims on behalf of all persons in the Settlement. Plaintiffs allege that when a borrower was required to have insurance for their property pursuant to a residential mortgage or home equity loan or line of credit, and evidence of acceptable coverage was not provided (for example, when the insurance policy did not exist or had lapsed), Caliber would place insurance in a manner such that Caliber and/or Vericrest received an unauthorized benefit. Plaintiffs allege further that Caliber did so primarily to receive “kickbacks” from the Assurant Defendants or other insurance providers. Plaintiffs also allege that the way in which LPI Policies were obtained and placed caused the rates and premiums to be excessive. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Adam Moskowitz****The Moskowitz Law Firm, PLLC****2 Alhambra Plaza****Suite 601****Coral Gables, FL 33134****305-740-1423 (Ph.)** |
| **10-29-2018** | **16-MD-02752** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Yahoo! Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation**This lawsuit was brought on behalf of the individuals impacted by the Data Breaches against Yahoo and its small business services provider, Aabaco Small Business, LLC. Plaintiffs’ claim that Defendants failed to adequately protect their Personal Information and that they were injured as a result. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:****John Yanchunis****MORGAN & MORGAN COMPLEX**  **LITIGATION GROUP****201 N. Franklin Street****7th Floor****Tampa, Florida 33602****jyanchunis@ForThePeople.com** |
| **10-30-2018** | **18-CV-00413** | **(W.D. Wash.)** | **James Jantos v. CenturyLink QC, et al.**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the Satellite Home Viewer Extension and Reauthorization Act, 47 U.S.C. § 338(i), CenturyLink and DIRECTV had disclosed or failed to protect information related to hisDIRECTV subscription contained in his CenturyLink bill, which Plaintiff alleged was accessible to others online. Plaintiff has since amended his complaint to add a claim against CenturyLink only for violations of theTelecommunications Act, 47 U.S.C. § 222, based on the same alleged facts. Specifically, Plaintiff alleged that after searching the internet for a phone number he did not recognize on his CenturyLink bill, hediscovered that his March 2017 bill, which included information related to his DIRECTV subscription, was publicly available online via a unique URL, and that he and his colleague acting at his direction were able to access CenturyLink bills of other customers. Plaintiff did not allege that any bill included credit or debit card information, social security number, or date of birth; nor did he allege that anyone other than himself and his colleague accessed his or anyone else’s bill. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****SIRIANNI YOUTZ**  **SPOONEMORE HAMBURGER Richard E. Spoonemore Chris R. Youtz** **701 Fifth Avenue****Suite 2560****Seattle, WA 98104****206 223-0303 (Ph.)****206 223-0246 (Fax)****cyoutz@sylaw.com****rspoonemore@sylaw.com** |
| **10-31-2018** | **17-CV-03955** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Nakooka, et al. v. Dollar Tree Stores, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that Dollar Tree has a policy that store employees must wear only green shirts and black pants, that this clothing constitutes a uniform under California law, and that Dollar Tree violated California law by failing to reimburse employees for the cost of this clothing. Based on this allegation, Plaintiffs assert claims under (1) California Labor Code sections 201-204, 218.5, 221, 223, 226, 1194.2, 1197, 1198 and 2802; (2) Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order 7-2001, section 9(A); and (3) California Business and Professions Code section 17200 et seq., (the “UCL”). Based on these claims, Plaintiffs seek reimbursement for the cost of this clothing, recovery of penalties, and an injunction against Dollar Tree engaging in these practices going forward.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Randall B. Aiman-Smith****Reed W.L. Marcy****Hallie Von Rock****Carey A. James****Brent A. Robinson****Aiman-Smith & Marcy****7677 Oakport Street****Suite 1150****Oalkand, CA 94621****510 817-2711 (Ph.)****510 562-6830 (Fax)****ras@asmlawyers.com****rwlm@asmlawyers.com****hvr@asmlawyers.com****caj@asmlawyers.com****bar@asmlawyers.com** |