| **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **12-3-2018** | **13-CV-0211** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Sullivan, et al. v. Barclays plc, et al.**  **Re Defendants: JPMorgan Chase & Co. and JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. (collectively, “JPMorgan”)**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants did so by using several means of manipulation. For example, Plaintiffs allege that panel banks that made daily Euribor submissions to Thomson Reuters falsely reported banks’ costs of borrowing in order to financially benefit their Euribor Products positions. Plaintiffs also allege that Defendants requested that other Defendants make false Euribor submissions on their behalf to benefit their Euribor Products positions. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion call or visit**  **800-492-9154 (Ph.)**  [**WWW.EURIBORSETTLEMENT.COM**](http://WWW.EURIBORSETTLEMENT.COM) |
| **12-3-2018** | **18-CV-00328** | **(D.R.I.)** | **Stephen Del Sesto, et al. v. Prospect Chartercare, LLC, et al.**  **Re Defendants: CharterCARE Community Board (“CCCB”)**  Plaintiffs allege that under the Employees Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended (“ERISA”), and state law, the Defendants were obligated to fully fund the Plan, and other related claims including allegations of fraud and misrepresentation. | **Not set yet**  Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more information write or call:**  **Max Wistow**  **Stephen P. Sheehan**  **Benjamin Ledsham**  **Wistow, Sheehan &**  **Loveley, P.C.**  **61 Weybosset Street**  **Providence, RI 02903**  **401 831-2700 (Ph.)** |
| **12-3-2019** | **16-CV-06496** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Dennis, et al. v. JPMorgan Chase & Co., et al.**  **Re Defendants: Barclays plc, Barclays Bank plc, Barclays Capital Inc., Citigroup,**  **Inc., Citibank, N.A., Coöperatieve Rabobank U.A. (f/k/a Coöperatieve Centrale Raiffeisen-Boerenleenbank B.A.), Crédit Agricole**  **S.A., Crédit Agricole CIB, Deutsche Bank AG, DB Group Services (UK) Ltd., HSBC Holdings plc, HSBC Bank plc, ICAP plc, ICAP**  **Europe Limited, JPMorgan Chase & Co., JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., The Royal Bank of Scotland plc, Société Générale SA, and**  **UBS AG (collectively, “Defendants”)**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants did so by using several means of manipulation. For example, Plaintiffs allege that panel banks that made daily Euribor submissions to Thomson Reuters falsely reported banks’ costs of borrowing in order to financially benefit their Euribor Products positions. Plaintiffs also allege that Defendants requested that other Defendants make false Euribor submissions on their behalf to benefit their Euribor Products positions. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants continuously conspired to fix the prices of Euribor Products in the over-the-counter market to financially benefit their own Euribor Products positions. In addition to coordinating Euribor submissions and agreeing on where to price Euribor Products, Plaintiffs allege that in order to effectuate their manipulations of Euribor and Euribor Products during the Class Period, Defendants engaged in “pushing cash,” transmitted false bids and offers, used derivative traders as submitters, and rigged bids and offers for Euribor Products. Plaintiffs have asserted legal claims under various theories, including federal antitrust law, the Commodity Exchange Act (“CEA”), the Racketeering Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (“RICO”), and common law. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Vincent Briganti**  **Lowey Dannenberg, P.C.**  **44 South Broadway**  **Suite 1100**  **White Plains, NY 10601**  **Christopher Lovell**  **Lovell Stewart Halebian**  **Jacobson LLP**  **61 Broadway – Suite 501**  **New York, NY 10006** |
| **12-6-2018** | **14-CV—3428** | **(S.D. Tex.)** | **In re: Cobalt International Energy Inc. Securities Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Morgan Stanley & Co. LLC, Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC, Citigroup Global Markets Inc., J.P. Morgan Securities LLC, Tudor, Pickering, Holt & Co. Securities, Inc., Deutsche Bank Securities Inc., RBC Capital Markets, LLC, UBS Securities LLC, Howard Weil Incorporated, Stifel, Nicolaus & Company, Incorporated, Capital One Southcoast, Inc., and Lazard Capital Markets LLC (“Underwriter Settling Defendants”)**  Plaintiffs allege that 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. | **2-13-2019** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Entwistle & Cappucci LLP**  **Attn: Andrew J. Entwistle**  **299 Park Avenue**  **20th Floor**  **New York, NY 10171**  **212 894-7200 (Ph.)**  **212 894-7272 (Fax)**  [**aentwistle@entwistle-law.com**](mailto:aentwistle@entwistle-law.com) |
| **12-6-2018** | **15-CV-04883** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Extreme Networks, Inc. Securities Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Extreme Networks, Inc. (“Extreme Networks”), Charles W. Berger (“Berger”), Kenneth B. Arola (“Arola”), and John T. Kurtzweil (Kurtzwel”) (collectively, “Defendants”)**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants made false and misleading representations regarding the  success of Extreme’s post-acquisition integration with its former competitor, Enterasys Networks, Inc. (“Enterasys”), as well as developments in Extreme’s key partnership with Lenovo Group, Ltd. (“Lenavo”). As a result of these alleged misrepresentations and omissions,  Extreme’s stock allegedly traded at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **LABATON SUCHAROW LLP**  **Carol C. Villegas**  **(Alec T. Coquin)**  **(pro hac vice)**  **140 Broadway**  **New York, NY 10005**  **212 907-0700 (Ph.)**  **212 818-0477 (Fax)**  [**cvillegas@labaton.com**](mailto:cvillegas@labaton.com)  [**acoquin@labaton.com**](mailto:acoquin@labaton.com) |
| **12-6-2018** | **17-CV-5098** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Lawrence Bradford v. Anthem, Inc. and Anthem UM Services, Inc. (collectively, “Anthem”)**  This lawsuit concerns whether Anthem improperly classified 2C-ADR as in investigational and/or not “medically necessary” and excluded the procedure from coverage from 8-24-2013 through 8-17-2016. |  | **For more information write to:**  **Robert S. Gianelli**  **GIANELLI & MORRIS**  **A Law Corporation**  **550 South Hope Street**  **Suite 1645**  **Los Angeles, CA 90071** |
| **12-6-2018** | **16-CV-04069** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re K12 Inc. Securities Litigation**  Plaintiffs filed and served their Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint (the “FAC”) asserting claims against all Defendants, along with Ronald Packard and Timothy Murray under Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, and against the Individual Defendants, along with Ronald Packard and Timothy Murray under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. Among other things, the FAC alleged that Defendants failed to disclose that K12 received a notice concerning the automatic renewal of its management contract with the Agora Cyber Charter School (“Agora”). The FAC further alleged that the prices of K12 publicly traded securities were artificially inflated as a result of Defendants’ allegedly false and misleading statements and omissions and declined when the truth was revealed. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:**  **Robert S. Gianelli**  **GIANELLI & MORRIS**  **A Law Corporation**  **550 South Hope Street Suite 1645**  **Los Angeles, CA 90071**  [**rob.gianelli@gmlawyers.com**](mailto:rob.gianelli@gmlawyers.com) |
| **12-7-2019** | **16-CV-01193** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Parker, et al. v. Universal Pictures, et al.**  The lawsuit alleges that Defendants sent text messages to Plaintiffs’ wireless telephone numbers without prior express written consent in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 USC § 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. Specifically, the Complaint alleges that Defendant sent text messages to promote the release of the film Warcraft in the summer of 2016. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Edmund A. Normand**  **Alex Couch**  **NORMAND PLLC**  **3165 McCrory Place**  **Suite 175**  **Orlando, FL 32803**  **407 603-6031 (Ph.)** |
| **12-10-2018** | **14-CV-00894** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Kerry O’Shea v. American Solar Solution, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) by calling persons on their cellular phones using an automatic telephone dialing system or artificial or prerecorded voice, without prior express consent. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, or e-mail:**  **Ronald A. Marron**  **Alexis M. Wood**  **Kas L. Gallucci**  **Law Offices of**  **Ronald A. Marron**  **651 Arroyo Drive**  **San Diego, CA 92103**  **619 696-9006 (Ph.)**  [**ron@consumersadvocates.com**](mailto:ron@consumersadvocates.com)  [**alexis@consumersadvocates.com**](mailto:alexis@consumersadvocates.com)  [**kas@consumersadvocates.com**](mailto:kas@consumersadvocates.com) |
| **12-11-2018** | **15-CV-00563** | **(D. Minn.)** | **Shoots v. iQor Holdings, Inc.**  Plaintiffs alleged that Defendant violated federal and state wage and hour laws by deducting certain work hours and failing to pay for short rest breaks under its TimeQey system and related policies. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:**  **Rachhana T. Srey**  **NICHOLS KASTER, PLLP**  **4600 IDS Center**  **80 South Eighth Street**  **Minneapolis, MN 55402**  [**srey@nka.com**](mailto:srey@nka.com) |
| **12-12-2018** | **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. | **3-28-2019** | **For more information write or call:**  **Charles A. Jones**  **Kelly Mcinerney**  **JONES LAW FIRM**  **9585 Prototype Court**  **Suite B**  **Reno, Nevada 89521**  **775 853-6440 (Ph.)** |
| **12-12-2018** | **16-CV-8370** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Teresa Garcia v. Steven Banks**  Plaintiff alleges that Human Resources Administration (“HRA”) did not determine a disabled person’s eligibility for Medicaid within 90 days of receiving her application. The lawsuit also alleged that HRA has a policy and/or practice of not making eligibility determinations for individuals who apply for Medicaid on the basis of disability in a timely manner. | **3-12-2019** | **For more information write or call:**  **Nina Keilin**  **225 Broadway #2008**  **New York NY 10007**  **212 302-7760 (Ph.)** |
| **12-13-2018** | **17-CV-02161** | **(E.D. La.)** | **Casso’s Wellness Store & Gym LLC v. Spectrum Laboratory Products, Inc.**  Plaintiff, Casso’s Wellness Center & Gym, LLC (hereinafter “Plaintiff”), sued Spectrum alleging that Spectrum violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) by sending, via facsimile transmission, unsolicited advertisements that did not comply with the TCPA’s opt-out notice requirements. The Faxes promoted products sold, or services provided, by Spectrum. The TCPA provides that a person who is sent an advertisement in violation of the TCPA may bring an action against the sender and recover either its actual damages or statutory damages of $500 per fax transmission. Further, the TCPA provides that the Court may in its discretion increase the statutory damages up to a maximum of $1,500 per fax transmission if the plaintiff proves that the defendant willfully violated the TCPA. | **3-13-2019** | **For more inforamtion call:**  **Settlement Administrator**  **1-866 447-1737 (Ph.)** |
| **12-14-2018** | **16-CV-00978** | **(E.D. Tex.)** | **Hall v. Rent-A-Center, Inc., et al.**  **Robert D.Davis, and Guy J. Constant (collectively, “Released Defendant Parties”)**  Plaintiff alleges that alleges that Defendants made a number of materially false and misleading statements regarding the Company’s new point-of-sale (“POS”) information management system, also referred to as the Store Information Management System (“SIMS”). Defendants allegedly failed to disclose that SIMS had a history of ongoing stability and functionality problems, which jeopardized a number of Company initiatives that depended on its successful Companywide implementation. The Complaint further alleges that when the problems with the POS implementation and its impact on the Company’s sales and collection efforts was disclosed to the market, the Company’s stock price declined causing damages to the proposed class. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Labaton Sucharow LLP**  **Jonathan Gardner**  **140 Broadway**  **New York, NY 10005** |
| **12-14-2018** | **16-CV-00172** | **(E.D. Ms.)** | **Ronald McAllister, et al. v. The St. Louis Rams**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated rights that the plaintiffs have under certain contracts. Those contracts gave the plaintiffs licenses, called “personal seat licenses” or “PSLs,” to purchase season tickets to St. Louis Rams home games. Two PSL contracts exist. The first, known as “the FANS PSL Agreement” was used by an entity known as FANS, Inc., to sell PSLs until 3-31-1996. The second, known as “the Rams PSL Agreement,” was used by the Rams to sell PSLs after FANS, Inc. stopped selling them. The Rams PSL Agreement also applies to any PSLs that were “upgraded” by their owners (i.e. where the owner purchased a more expensive PSL after initially purchasing a lower value PSL) and to PSLs that were obtained by transfer from a previous owner. The plaintiffs make claims of breach of contract, violation of the Missouri Merchandising Practices Act, Mo. Rev. Stat. § 407.010, et seq. (“MMPA”) and, depending on the plaintiff, other claims, arising out of the Rams’ relocation to Los Angeles, California in 2016. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **THE BRUNING LAW FIRM, LLC**  **Anthony S. Bruning**  **Anthony S. Bruning, Jr.**  **Ryan L. Bruning**  **Edward M. Roth**  **555 Washington Avenue Suite 600**  **St. Louis, MO 63101**  **314 735-8100 (Ph.)**  **314-735-8020 (Fax)** |
| **12-17-2018** | **18-CV-00841** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Orrington v. Mesa Laboratories, Inc.**  Plaintiff received an unsolicited fax advertisement promoting Defendant’s goods or services that did not contain a proper opt out notice. Plaintiff alleged that these faxes violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), the Illinois Consumer Fraud Act (“ICFA”) and common laws of conversion, nuisance and trespass to chattels. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**  [**www.edcombs.com**](http://www.edcombs.com) |
| **12-17-2018** | **18-CV-22880** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Wijesinha v. Susan B. Anthony List, Inc. (“SBA”)**  The lawsuit alleges that SBA List sent a text message to Plaintiff’s wireless telephone number using an automatic telephone dialing system 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 visit:**  [**www.SBATCPAsettlement.com**](http://www.SBATCPAsettlement.com) |
| **12-17-2018** | **15-CV-3608** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Marvin v. Dave & Buster’s Inc.**  The Plaintiff in this case alleges that Defendants, as part of the Position to Win Program, reduced the hours of certain Dave & Buster's employees from full-time to part-time in order to avoid having to offer and pay for employee health benefits. Plaintiff alleged that cutting those hours for the purpose of depriving employees of benefits was a violation of federal law. Plaintiff sought reinstatement of hours and benefits, and lost wages and benefits incidental to the reinstatement of hours and benefits. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Karin E. Fisch.**  **Abbey Spanier, LLP**  **212 East 39th Street**  **New York, New York 10016** |
| **12-17-2018** | **17-CV-00498** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **George Alea and Curtis Hamburg, et al. v. Wilson Sporting Goods Co.**  The class action lawsuit claims that the connection between the barrel and the handle of certain Prime BBCOR Bats manufactured and sold by Wilson are defective. The lawsuit pursues claims for violations of consumer protection statutes, unjust enrichment, and breach of warranty. | **6-4-2019** | **For more inforamion write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Jon Herskowitz**  **Baron & Herskowitz**  **9100 S. Dadeland Blvd.**  **Suite 1704**  **Miami, FL 33156**  **305 670-0101 (Ph.)**  **305 670-2393 (Fax)**  [**jon@bhfloridalaw.com**](mailto:jon@bhfloridalaw.com) |
| **12-17-2018** | **12-CV-01592** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Morning Song Bird Food Litigation**  Plaintiffs allege in the lawsuits that the application of certain pesticides, Storcide II and Actellic 5E, to the Morning Song Bird Food products and the sale of those products violated certain federal or state laws. Plaintiffs sought refunds for their purchases, among other things. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **Robbins Geller Rudman**  **& Dowd LLP**  **655 West Broadway Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **12-17-2018** | **17-CV-334** | **(E.D. Okla.)** | **Chieftain Royalty Company, et al. v. Marathon Oil Company**  The Litigation seeks damages for Defendant’ alleged failure to pay statutory interest on payments made by Defendant (or on behalf of Defendant) outside the time periods set forth in the Production Revenue Standards Act, 52 Okla. St. §570.1, et seq. (the “PRSA”) for oil and gas production proceeds from oil and gas wells in Oklahoma. Specifically, in their Complaint, Plaintiffs allege that Defendant: (1) failed to pay or delayed payment of statutory interest on payments made outside the time periods set forth in the PRSA or any applicable statue or contract; (2) underpaid statutory interest due under the PRSA or any applicable contract; (3) failed to pay interest on any escheat payments made to the State of Oklahoma or any other state or government agency pursuant to the Uniform Unclaimed Property Act, Unclaimed Pooled Monies Act, or similar statutes; (4) awaited a demand prior to paying statutory interest under the PRSA; (5) misrepresented and/or omitted the amount of statutory interest owed; and (6) is liable to Class Members for breach of duties under the PRSA, actual fraud constructive fraud, deceit, unjust enrichment/disgorgement, accounting, punitive damages, and injunctive relief. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Patrick M. Ryan**  **Phillip G. Whaley**  **Jason A. Ryan**  **Paula M. Jantzen**  **Ryan Whaley Coldiron**  **Hantzen Peters &**  **Webber PLLC**  **900 Robinson Renaissance**  **119 North Robinson**  **Oklahoma City, OK 73102**  **Robert N. Barnes**  **Patranell Lewis**  **Emily Nash Kitch**  **Barnes & Lewis, LLP**  **208 N.W. 60th Street**  **Oklahoma City, OK 73118** |
| **12-17-2018** | **17-CV-01091** | **(D. Conn.)** | **Simerlein, et al. v. Toyota Motor Corporation, et al.**  **Re Defendants: Toyota Motor Corporation, Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc., Toyota Motor Engineering & Manufacturing North America, Inc. Toyota Motor North America, Inc., and Toyota Motor Manufacturing, Indiana, Inc. (“Defendants” or “Toyota”)**  The class action lawsuit claims that the sliding doors in certain Sienna vehicles are defective. The lawsuit pursues claims for violations of various state consumer protection statutes, among other claims. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:**  **W. Daniel “Dee” Miles III**  **Beasley, Allen, Crow,**  **Methvin, Portis &**  **Miles, P.C.**  **218 Commerce Street**  **Montgomery, Alabama 36104**  **800 898-2034 (Ph.)**  [**Dee.Miles@BeasleyAllen.com**](mailto:Dee.Miles@BeasleyAllen.com) |
| **12-19-2018** | **15-CV-03820** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Resistors Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Panasonic Corporation and Panasonic Corporation of North America (the “Panasonic Defendants”)**  The lawsuit alleges that 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., and various state antitrust and consumer protection laws. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, e-mail or call:**  **Adam J. Zapala**  **Cotchett, Pitre &**  **McCarthy, LLP**  **San Francisco Airport**  **Office Center**  **840 Malcolm Road**  **Suite 200**  **Burlingame, CA 94010**  [**azapala@cpmlegal.com**](mailto:azapala@cpmlegal.com)  **650 697-6000 (Ph.)** |
| **12-19-2018** | **17-MD-02807** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **In re: Sonic Corp. Customer Data Breach Litigation**  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** |
| **12-19-2018** | **12-MD-02311**  **16-CV-04002** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **In re: Automotive Steel Tubes – Automobile Dealership Action**  **Re Defendants: Maruyasu Industries Co., Ltd. (“Maruyasu”) and Curtis-Maruyasu America (“CMA”), Inc. (collectively, “Maruyasu Entities”)**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants and unnamed co-conspirators, manufacturers and/or suppliers of Automotive Steel Tubes 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 Automotive Steel Tubes. According to the United States Department of Justice (“DOJ”), Defendants’ conspiracy successfully targeted the long-struggling United States automotive industry, raising prices for car manufacturers and automobile dealers alike. | **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**  **LARSON • KING, LLP**  **2800 Wells Fargo Place**  **30 East Seventh Street**  **St. Paul, MN 55101** |
| **12-19-2018** | **12-MD-02311**  **13-CV-02202** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **Automotive Fuel Injection Systems – Automobile Dealership Action**  **Re Defendants: Maruyasu Industries Co., Ltd. (“Maruyasu”) and Curtis-Maruyasu America (“CMA”), Inc. (collectively, “Maruyasu Entities”)**  Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of the Maruyasu Defendants' alleged participation in an unlawful 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, (see CAFA above). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Same as above.** |
| **12-20-2018** | **15-CV-222** | **(N.D. Ala.)** | **In re: Community Health Systems, Inc., Customer Data Security Data Breach Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Community Health Systems, Inc. and Community Health Systems Professional Services Corporation n/k/a CHSPSC**  The lawsuit claims that CHSPSC was responsible for the Security Incident that occurred in April and June 2014 and asserts claims such as: breach of contract, breach of implied contract, unjust enrichment, negligence, negligence per se, bailment, wantonness, and claims under various state consumer protection and data breach notification laws, and also federal statutory claims for violation of the Fair Credit Reporting Act. The lawsuit seeks compensation for people who allegedly had losses as a result of the Security Incident. | **8-13-2019** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **Karen Hanson Riebel**  **Lockridge Grindal Nauen**  **P.L.L.P.**  **100 Washington Avenue S. Suite 2200**  **Minneapolis, MN 55401** |
| **12-20-2018** | **15-CV-03820** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Resistors Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Kamaya Electric Co., Ltd. and Kamaya, Inc. (together, “Kamaya Defendants” or the “Settling Defendants”)**  The lawsuit alleges that 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., and various state antitrust and consumer protections laws. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, e-mail or call:**  **Adam J. Zapala**  **Cotchett, Pitre &**  **McCarthy, LLP**  **SanFrancisco Airport**  **Office Center**  **840 Malcolm Road**  **Suite 200**  **Burlingame, CA 94010**  [**azapala@cpmlegal.com**](mailto:azapala@cpmlegal.com)  **650 697-6000 (Ph.)** |
| **12-20-2018** | **17-CV-515** | **(S.D. Ohio)** | **Evans v. American Power & Gas LLC, et al.**  **Re Defendants: American Power & Gas, LLC and Consumer Sales Solutions, LLC (“Defendants”)**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) by making calls to certain cellular telephone numbers using an automated dialer without the consent of the user or subscriber of that number. The Action was originally filed in 2017, and seeks statutory damages against Defendants. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Brian Murphy**  **Jonathan Misny**  **JB Hadden**  **Murray Murphy Moul +**  **Basil LLP**  **1114 Dublin Road**  **Columbus, OH 43215**  **(614) 488-0400 (Ph.)** |
| **12-20-2018** | **15-CV-03820** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Resistors Antitrust Litigation**  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. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Hagens Berman Sobol**  **Shapiro LLP**  **715 Hearst Avenue**  **Suite 202**  **Berkeley, CA 94710**  **510 725-3000 (Ph.)** |
| **12-20-2018** | **16-CV-12808** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **Alice Raden, et al. v. Martha Stewart Living Omnimedia, Inc., et al.**  **Re Defendants: Martha Stewart Living Omnimedia, Inc. and Meredith Corporation (“Defendants”)**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated Michigan’s Preservation of Personal Privacy Act, M.C.L. § 445.1712 (PPPA”) by disclosing information related to their customers’ magazine subscriptions to third parties. Under the PPPA, only purchases made “at retail” are a violation and entitle a consumer to relief. | **7-31-2019** | **For more information visit:**  [**www.mslmagazinesettlement.com**](http://www.mslmagazinesettlement.com) |
| **12-21-2018** | **16-CV-1346** | **(E.D. Mo.)** | **Valeska Schultz, et al. v. Edward D. Jones & Co., L.P., et al.**  **Re Defendants: Edward D. Jones & Co., L.P., The Jones Financial Companies, L.L.L.P.**  **the Edward Jones Investment and Education Committee, the Edward Jones Profit Sharing and**  **401(k) Administrative Committee and members of those committees (together, “Defendants”).**  Plaintiffs allege that the Plan selected investment options that consisted predominantly of mutual funds managed by “partners” and “preferred partners” of Edward Jones — investment management companies that worked closely with Edward Jones brokers and agents and paid revenue sharing to Edward Jones based on Edward Jones marketing their funds to Edward Jones clients. Plaintiffs allege there were superior, less expensive investment options available that Defendants should have chosen for the Plan. Plaintiffs also allege that Defendants caused Plan participants to pay excessive recordkeeping fees. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Gregory Y. Porter**  **BAILEY & GLASSER LLP**  **910 17th Street, NW**  **Suite 800**  **Washington, DC 20006** |
| **12-21-2018** | **16-CV-06496** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Dennis, et al v. JP Morgan Chase & Co., et al.**  **Re Defendants: JPMorgan Chase & Co. and JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. (collectively “JPMorgan”)**  Plaintiffs alleged, among other things, that Defendant, from 1-1-2007, through at least 12-31-2011, acted unlawfully by, *inter alia*, manipulating, aiding and abetting the manipulation of, and conspiring, colluding or engaging in racketeering activities to manipulate the Singapore Interbank Offered Rate (“SIBOR”), the Singapore Swap Offer Rate (“SOR”), and the prices of SIBOR- and/or SORBased Derivatives, in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq*., the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968, and the common law. For more information see CAFA Notice on page 2 above. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Vincent Briganti**  **Lowey Dannenberg, P.C.**  **44 South Broadway**  **Suite 1100**  **White Plains, NY 10601**  **Christopher Lovell**  **Lovell Stewart Halebian**  **Jacobson LLP**  **61 Broadway – Suite 501**  **New York, NY 10006** |
| **12-21-2018** | **16-CV-02162** | **(D.D.C.)** | **Ferrer, et al. v. CareFirst, Inc., et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that CareFirst’s coverage for CLS did not comply with the preventive services coverage mandate of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (the “ACA”), the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (“ERISA”), and the plan documents. In particular, the lawsuit claimed that CareFirst did not provide insureds access to in-network trained providers of CLS and did not properly adjudicate claims for CLS as preventive claims. As a result, it was alleged that CareFirst caused insureds to incur out-of-pocket costs, including costs for co-payments, deductibles and co-insurance (which costs are also called “cost-sharing”). | **4-9-2019** | **For more information visit:**  [**www.CareFirstBreastfeedingSupportClassAction.com**](http://www.CareFirstBreastfeedingSupportClassAction.com) |
| **12-21-2018** | **17-CV-01649** | **(W.D. Pa.)** | **Gertrude Mae Flynn v. Aimbridge Hospitality, LLC**  The Lawsuit asserts that Aimbridge Hospitality, LLC (Aimbridge”) violated the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. (“ADA”) by failing to provide equivalent accessible transportation services at hotels owned and/or operated by Aimbridge in the United States. The Lawsuit seeks (1) injunctive relief to modify Aimbridge’s practices to ensure accessibility of Aimbridge’s transportation services for people who use wheelchairs or scooters for mobility, and (2) costs expenses and attorneys’ fees for prosecuting the case. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:**  **R. Bruce Carlson**  **Carlson Lynch Sweet Kilpela & Capenter, LLP**  **1133 Penn Avenue**  **5th Floor**  **Pittsburgh, PA 15222**  [**bcarlson@carlsonlynch.com**](mailto:bcarlson@carlsonlynch.com)  [**www.carlsonlynch.com**](http://www.carlsonlynch.com) |
| **12-21-2018** | **15-CV-23352** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Mohamed v. American Motor Company, LLC and Off Lease Only**  Plaintiff alleges that InstantCarOffer.com (“ICO”) violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPS”) by sending text messages to persons without their prior express consent or express written consent and that OLO is vicariously responsible for these alleged violations of the TCPA. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Scott D. Owens**  **Scott D. Owens, P.A.**  **3800 S. Ocean Dr.**  **Suite 235**  **Hollywood, Florida 33019** |
| **12-21-2018** | **17-MD-02801**  **14-CV-03264** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Capacitors Antitrust Litigation**  **In re: Capacitors Antitrust Litigation (the “Action”)**  **Re Defendants: Rubycon Corporation and Rubycon America, Inc. (“Rubycon”)**  The lawsuit claims that Defendants entered into agreements artificially to raise, fix, or stabilize the prices of aluminum, tantalum, and film capacitors (“Capacitors”) in violation of federal antitrust law. Each of the Defendants, including the Settling Defendants, expressly denies that it violated any laws or engaged in any wrongdoing, except  that: (a) on 1-21-2016, NEC TOKIN Corporation pleaded guilty to participating in a conspiracy to fix prices of certain electrolytic capacitors; (b) on 6-9-2016, Hitachi Chemical Co., Ltd. pleaded guilty to participating in a conspiracy to fix prices of certain electrolytic capacitors; (c) on 10-11- 2017, ELNA Co., Ltd and Holystone pleaded guilty to participating in a conspiracy to fix prices of certain electrolytic capacitors; (d) on 10-12-2017, Rubycon Corporation pleaded guilty to participating in a conspiracy to fix prices of certain electrolytic capacitors; (e)  on 10-25-2017, Matsuo Electric Co., Ltd. pleaded guilty to participating in a conspiracy to fix prices of certain  electrolytic capacitors; (f) on 11-8-2017, Nichicon Corporation pleaded guilty to participating in a conspiracy to fix prices of certain electrolytic capacitors; (g) on 5-31-2018, Nippon Chemi-Con Corporation pleaded guilty to participating in a conspiracy to fix prices of certain electrolytic capacitors; and (h) Panasonic Corporation reported itself to the United States Department of Justice and acknowledged that it and Sanyo Electric Co., Ltd., which was previously a separate entity but which was acquired by Panasonic Corporation, had violated the antitrust laws of the United States in relation to the prices of certain capacitors. | **5-8-2019** | **For more information visit or call:**  [**www.capacitorsantitrustsettlement.com**](http://www.capacitorsantitrustsettlement.com)  **1 866 903-1223 (Ph.)** |
| **12-21-2018** | **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 his  DIRECTV 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 the  Telecommunications 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, he  discovered 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. |  | **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**](mailto:cyoutz@sylaw.com)  [**rspoonemore@sylaw.com**](mailto:rspoonemore@sylaw.com) |
| **12-21-2018** | **7-CV-00130** | **(W.D. KY.)** | **Durand, et al. v. The Hanover Insurance Group, Inc. and The Allmerica Financial Cash Balance Pension Plan (the “Plan”)**  The lawsuit, brought by former employees who participated in the Plan, alleges that the Plan failed to calculate benefits in accordance with the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974. The lawsuit alleges that the Plan projected certain benefits using a calculation that understated the value of future earnings credits. The Plan denied that it was required to pay additional benefits. After several years of litigation, the parties have decided to settle the case. | **3-22-2019** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:**  **Eli Gottesdiener**  **Gottesdiener Law Firm, PLLC**  **498 7th Street**  **Brooklyn, NY 11215**  **718 788-1500 (Ph.)**  [**eli@gottesdienerlaw.com**](mailto:eli@gottesdienerlaw.com) |
| **12-24-2018** | **17-CV-0100** | **(W.D. MO.)** | **Justin M. Cook v. Bank of America, N.A.**  The lawsuit concerns whether Bank of America improperly deducted a “Legal Process Fee” from  judgment-debtor’s accounts when served with a writ of garnishment pursuant to Missouri garnishment proceedings, without adhering to procedures provided by Missouri law. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **John F. Edgar**  **Edgar Law Firm LLC**  **1032 Pennsylvania Avenue**  **Kansas City, MO 64105** |
| **12-27-2018** | **13-CV-03072** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: MyFordTouch Consumer Litigation (“MFT”)**  Plaintiffs allege that MFTs on these vehicles are defective because, among other things, they will not respond to voice commands; do not connect to the owner’s mobile device; provide inaccurate directions and/or misread the location of the vehicle; and/or freeze up or crash altogether. 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 to:**  **Steve W. Berman**  **Catherine Y.N. Gannon**  **Craig Spiegel**  **Hagens Berman Sobol**  **Shapiro LLP**  **1301 2nd Avenue**  **Suite 2000**  **Seattle, Washington 98101**  **206 623-7292 (Ph.)**  [**Steve@hbsslaw.com**](mailto:Steve@hbsslaw.com)  [**Catherineg@hbsslaw.com**](mailto:Catherineg@hbsslaw.com)  [**Craigs@hbsslaw.com**](mailto:Craigs@hbsslaw.com) |
| **12-27-2018** | **13-CV-01471** | **(D. Conn.)** | **Langan v. Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc.**  The plaintiff in the lawsuit assert that the Products’ labels were false or misleading before they were changed (in November of 2012 for the Wash and Shampoo Product, and in November of 2013 for the Calming Comfort  Bath Product), by claiming that the Products were a “Natural Oat Formula.” | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Mark P. Kindall**  **IZARD, KINDALL &**  **RAABE, LLP**  **29 South Main Street Suite 305**  **West Hartford, CT 06107** |
| **12-27-2018** | **18-CV-00590** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **Smith v. Temple University**  Plaintiff alleges violations of the Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law (“CPL”) Act of 12-16-1968, P.L. 1224, as amended, 73 P.S. §§20-1.1-201-9.3 and seek injunctive relief, compensatory, consequential, punitive damages, costs and reasonable attorney’s fees for TEMPLE’S’ deceptive and unfair business practices, as herein alleged. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Jason T. Brown**  **Brown, LLC**  **111 Town Square Place**  **Suite 400**  **Jersey City, NJ 07310**  **877 561-0000 (Ph.)**  **855 582-5297 (Fax)** |
| **12-28-2018** | **14-CV-03264** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Capacitors Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Nichicon Corporation and Nichicon (America) Corporation (collectively “Nichicon”)**  The lawsuit claims that Defendants entered into agreements artificially to raise, fix, or stabilize the prices of aluminum, tantalum, and film capacitors (“Capacitors”) in violation of federal antitrust law. Each of the Defendants, including the Settling Defendants, expressly denies that it violated any laws or engaged in any wrongdoing, except  that: (a) on 1-21-2016, NEC TOKIN Corporation pleaded guilty to participating in a conspiracy to fix prices of certain electrolytic capacitors; (b) on 6-9-2016, Hitachi Chemical Co., Ltd. pleaded guilty to participating in a conspiracy to fix prices of certain electrolytic capacitors; (c) on 10-11- 2017, ELNA Co., Ltd and Holystone pleaded guilty to participating in a conspiracy to fix prices of certain electrolytic capacitors; (d) on October 12, 2017, Rubycon Corporation pleaded guilty to participating in a conspiracy to fix prices of certain electrolytic capacitors; (e) on 10-25-2017, Matsuo Electric Co., Ltd. pleaded guilty to participating in a conspiracy to fix prices of certain electrolytic capacitors; (f) on 11-8- 2017, Nichicon Corporation pleaded guilty to participating in a conspiracy to fix prices of certain electrolytic capacitors; (g) on 5-31- 2018, Nippon Chemi-Con Corporation pleaded guilty to participating in a conspiracy to fix prices of certain electrolytic capacitors; and (h) Panasonic Corporation reported itself to the United States Department of Justice and acknowledged that it and Sanyo Electric Co., Ltd., which was previously a separate entity but which was acquired by Panasonic Corporation, had violated the antitrust laws of the United States in relation to the prices of certain capacitors. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion visit:**  [**www.capacitorsantitrustsettlement.com**](http://www.capacitorsantitrustsettlement.com)**.** |
| **12-28-2018** | **17-CV-03084** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Murphy v. JBS S.A.**  Plaintiff alleges that JBS’s public filings and statements included materially false statements and/or omitted material facts about alleged bribery payments made to Brazilian governmental officials, employees or political parties by individuals affiliated with JBS. The Complaint asserts that the alleged misstatements and omissions inflated the price of JBS ADRs. A final version of the Complaint was filed on 8-29-2018. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Nicholas I. Porritt**  **Adam M. Apton**  **Levi & Korsinsky, LLP**  **55 Broadway 10th Floor**  **New York, NY 10006**  **212 363-7500 (Ph.)**  **212 363-7171 (Fax)**  [**nporritt@zlk.com**](mailto:nporritt@zlk.com)  [**aapton@zlk.com**](mailto:aapton@zlk.com)  [**aapton@zlk.com**](mailto:aapton@zlk.com) |
| **12-31-2018** | **8-CV-457** | **(D. Ariz.)** | **Spinedex Physical Therapy, U.S.A., Inc., et al. v. United Healthcare of Arizona, Inc., et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants failed to comply with the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (“ERISA”) and the terms of various private sector employer-sponsored group health plans when processing claims for physical therapy benefits and nonsurgical spinal decompression therapy, regardless of whether the decompression therapy was performed by a physical therapist. More specifically, the Settling Plaintiffs allege that Defendants improperly denied coverage for nonsurgical spinal decompression therapy treatments—including, but not limited to, treatments using a Vertebral-Axial Decompression table (“VAX-D”)— on the basis that such treatments are experimental and unproven. The Settling Plaintiffs also allege that the Defendants’ processing of other physical therapy claims did not meet ERISA’s procedural requirements, and that Defendants’ methodologies for determining reimbursement amounts for Out-of-Network services resulted in underpayment of their physical therapy claims. While this class action settlement covers alleged improper denials for nonsurgical decompression therapy, it does not cover, on a class-wide basis, claims that the Settling Plaintiffs (i.e., Spinedex and Mr. Aragon) asserted in connection with other types of physical therapy treatments. However, the settlement does cover the Settling Plaintiffs’ individual claims relating to matters beyond nonsurgical spinal decompression therapy. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Joseph A. Garofolo**  **Garofolo & Ramsdell, LLP**  **3443 Golden Gate Way Suite H**  **Lafayette, CA 94549** |