|  **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name**  **Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **Website Link** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4-1-2015** | **13-CV-7465** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Bridgeport Pain Control Center, Ltd. v. MedPlus, Inc., et al.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that MedPlus and Quest Diagnostics Incorporated (collectively, “Defendants”) sent an unsolicited fax advertisement and that the sending of that fax and others like it violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act, as well as the Illinois Consumer Fraud Act and the Illinois common laws of conversion, private nuisance, and trespass to chattels. Plaintiff sought to represent a class of persons who allegedly were sent unsolicited fax advertisements regarding the commercial availability or quality of any property, good, or service of Defendants. The Class Period is from 10-17-2009 to date of entry of the Preliminary Approval Order.  | **8-25-2015** | Prepared by Brenda Berkley**For more information write, call, fax or visit:****Edelman, Combs, Latturner** **& Goodwin, LLC****20 S. Clark Street****Suite 1500****Chicago, IL 60603****312 739-4200 (Ph.)****312 419-0379 (Fax.)**[**www.edcombs.com**](http://www.edcombs.com) |
| **4-1-2015** | **11-CV-02781** | **(D. Minn.)** | **Roger Krueger, et al. v. Ameriprise Financial, Inc., et al.**Participant-plaintiffs allege that during the Class Period, Defendants violated ERISA by allowing Ameriprise 401(k) Plan’s (the “Plan”) record-keepers to receive unreasonable fees from the Plan, by imprudently and disloyally selecting proprietary mutual funds as core investment options in the Plan, and by charging unreasonable fees for those proprietary options. The Class Period is from 10-1-2005 to 2-28-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit, write call or fax:**[**www.AF401ksettlement.com**](http://www.AF401ksettlement.com)**Schlichter, Bogard & Denton****Attn: Ameriprise 401(k) Settlement****100 S. Fourth Street****St. Louis, MO 63102****314 621-6115 (Ph.)****314 621-7151 (Fax)** |
| **4-2-2015** | **09-CV-00852** | **(E.D. Wis.)** | **Fond du Lac Bumper Exchange Inc. v. Jui Li**Direct purchaser-plaintiff alleges that during the Class Period Defendants violated federal antitrust laws by agreeing to fix prices and limit supply for Aftermarket Automotive Sheet Metal Products (AMSM). Plaintiff also alleges wrongdoing, misconduct, misstatements, omissions, and class members were damaged thereby. The Class Period is from 1-1-2003 to date of Preliminary Approval. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Jason S. Hartley****Stueve Siegel Hanson, LLP****550 West C Street****Suite 610****San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **4-2-2015** | **12-CV-05493** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Majeed Seifi, Tracey Deakin, and Ronald Reyner v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege a defect in balance shaft sprockets in M272 (V-6) engines and idle gears in M273 (V-8) engines in certain model year 2005-2007 Mercedes-Benz vehicles that cause the gears to wear prematurely. Plaintiffs contend that Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC (“MBUSA”) had a duty to disclose this information to consumers at the time of purchasing the vehicle. Based on this conduct, Plaintiffs allege claims for violations of the New Jersey Consumer Fraud Act, California’s Consumer Legal Remedies Act and Unfair Competition Law. The Class Period covers vehicles leased or purchased years 2005-2007. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Roy A. Katriel****Katriel Law Firm****4225 Executive Square****Suite 600****La Jolla, CA 92037****Gary S. Graifman****Kantrowitz Goldhamer &** **Graifman, P.C.****747 Chestnut Ridge Road****Chestnut Ridge, NY 10977** |
| **4-2-2015** | **14-CV-01048** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Caroline Castellaw, et al. v. Excelsior College**Student-plaintiffs enrolled in the Associate in Applied Sciences in Nursing degree program at Excelsior College allege unlawful misrepresentations were made by Excelsior College to nursing students who failed the Clinical Performance in Nursing Exam (CPNE), paid for and were retested for the CPNE, again without passing on at least one occasion**.** The Class Period is from 2-19-2011 to 3-5-2015. | **7-15-2015** | **For more information write, e-mail or call:****John Hermina****George Hermina****The Hermina Law Group****Laurel Lakes Executive** **Park****8327 Cherry Lane****Laurel, Maryland 20707****law@herminalaw.com****301 776-2003 (Ph.)** |
| **4-2-2015** | **11-CV-01298** | **(D. Kan.)** | **Abdiaziz, et al. v. Tyson Foods, Inc. and Tyson Fresh Meats, Inc.**Employee-plaintiffs allege that Tyson failed to pay its workers for all time spent on compensable activities during the continuous workday, including, among other things, pre- and post-shift donning, doffing and walking. The plaintiffs alleged that Tyson violated the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) by failing to pay overtime for all hours worked over 40 in a week, and violated the Kansas Wage Payment Act (KWPA) by failing to pay “straight time” (i.e., hours under 40 in a week). The Class Period is from 4-30-2004 to 2-17-2009. | **7-2-2015** | **For more information write, call or fax:****George A. Hanson****Norman E. Siegel****STUEVE SIEGEL HANSON LLP****460 Nichols Road****Suite 200****Kansas City, MO 64112****(816) 714-7115 (Ph.)****(816) 714-7115 (Fax)** |
| **4-2-2015** | **13-CV-4921** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Booth et al. v. Strategic Realty Trust, Inc., (SRT)**Security-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated federal securities laws in issuing, selling, and underwriting shares of SRT common stock pursuant to offering materials that were false and misleading. The plaintiffs contend, among other things, that the offering materials for SRT common stock contained materially false and misleading statements and omitted material information about the financial condition of Anthony W. Thompson and the Thompson Defendants, the operation of and results achieved by previous real estate investment programs sponsored by Anthony W. Thompson and the Thompson Defendants, and about the nature, extent, and efficacy of SRT’s internal controls. During the litigation the plaintiffs also inquired into moneys paid or loaned to the Thompson Defendants or entities affiliated with the Thompson Defendants by SRT, the protocol in place for SRT and the Director Defendants’ evaluation and approval of transactions or agreements between SRT and Anthony W. Thompson, the Thompson Defendants or any entity affiliated with Anthony W. Thompson or the Thompson Defendants, and SRT and the Director Defendants’ monitoring and oversight of SRT’s indebtedness, debt financing strategies, and investment strategies. The Class Period is from 9-23-2010 to 2-7-2013. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Daniel C. Girard****Girard Gibbs LLP****601 California Street****14th Floor****San Francisco, CA 94108** |
| **4-3-2015** | **13-CV-04806** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Kolinek v. Walgreen Co.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Walgreens placed Prerecorded Prescription Calls to certain pharmacy customers’ cellular telephones without their consent. The lawsuit alleges Walgreens violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act because consumers did not agree to receive these calls. A “Prerecorded Prescription Call” is any prescription refill reminder call that Walgreens made to a cellular telephone using a prerecorded voice. The Court decided that this Settlement includes a Class of “all individuals in the United States to whom Walgreens placed a Prerecorded Prescription Call to their cellular telephone.” | **8-5-2015** | **For more information write to:****Jay Edelson****Rafey S. Balabanian****Ryan D. Andrews****Benjamin H. Richman****EDELSON PC****350 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1300****Chicago, Illinois 60654** |
| **4-6-2015** | **11-CV-10245** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Sarah Johnson v. Wozo, LLC, and Tatto, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Wozo Poster Club and Tatto, Inc. (together the “Defendants”) misled consumers who responded to a promotion for a “free” poster from Wozo.com by failing to adequately disclose that the consumers would be enrolled in the Wozo Poster Club and charged monthly membership fees. The Class Period is from 9-1-2010 to 11-1-2010. | **6-17-2015** | **For more information write to:****Thomas G. Shapiro****SHAPIRO HABER & URMY LLP****53 State Street****Boston, MA 02109****Karl S. Kronenberger****Virginia Sanderson****KRONENBERGER ROSENFELD,** **LLP****150 Post Street****Suite 520****San Francisco, CA 94108** |
| **4-6-2015** | **13-CV-04280** | **(W.D. Mo.)** | **Alame v. Norred & Associates, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Norred’s Consumer Authorization form, signed by prospective employees as part of Norred’s background check process, violates the Fair Credit Reporting Act because the disclosure is not in a document that consists solely of the disclosure and further the disclosure is not a “clear and conspicuous” disclosure that a criminal records check will be conducted. Plaintiff also alleges that after applying for work with Norred, signing a Consumer Authorization form, and submitting to a criminal background check, he was declined for employment based on the results of the background check and was not provided with both a copy of the background check results and a reasonable time to challenge the results of the background check in advance of Norred’s decision not to employ plaintiff. The Disclosure/Adverse Action Class Period is from 11-20-2011 to 9-23-2014. | **8-27-2015** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Charles Jason Brown****Jayson A. Watkins****Brown & Associates, LLC****301 S. U.S. 169 Hwy.****Gower, MO 64454****816 505-4529 (Ph.)****816 424-1337 (Fax)** |
| **4-6-2015** | **12-CV-9162** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Alechea Toney-Dick, X.T., Renee Moore, and Sherry Hananan v. Robert Doar, in his official capacity as Commissioner of the New York City Human Resources Administration, et al.**Applicant-plaintiffs allege that the New York Human Resources Administration (“HRA”) and the New York State Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance (“OTDA”), among others, denied individuals with disabilities meaningful access to D-SNAP benefits after Superstrom Sandy. Specifically, they challenged the requirement that applications for D-SNAP benefits be filed either in-person in Brooklyn or Staten Island or through an authorized representative. The four plaintiffs now represent two classes, which are: (a) disabled individuals who were eligible to apply for benefits from the Sandy D-SNAP; and (b) individuals who may be eligible to apply for benefits from a future D-SNAP program and who will need reasonable accommodations because of a disability (or disabilities). The Class Period is from 10-27-2012 to 11-25-2012. | **6-25-2-15** | **For more information write, e-mail or call:****Kenneth Stephens, Esq.****The Legal Aid Society****199 Water Street****New York, NY 10038****kstephens@legal-aid.org****212 577-3988 (Ph.)** |
| **4-6-2015** | **09-CV-02122** | **(D. Kan.)** | **Bennett v. Sprint Nextel Corporation, et al.**Securities-purchaser-plaintiff filed this securities class action on behalf of purchasers of Sprint securities. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants made a number of false and misleading statements that Sprint was on track to achieve billions of dollars in benefits from merger synergies, that Sprint improved its customer mix as a result of tightening credit standards, that the integration of Sprint and Nextel systems and operations was progressing as planned, and that the goodwill associated with the Nextel purchase was not impaired. The Class Period is from 10-26-2006 to 2-27-2008. | **Not Set yet** | **For more information write to:****Robbins Geller** **Rudman & Dowd LLP****Tor Gronborg****655 W. Broadway****Suite 1900****San Diego, CA 92101****Motley Rice LLC****James M. Hughes****29 Bridgeside Blvd.****Mount Pleasant, SC 29464** |
| **4-8-2015** | **10-CV-00253** | **(W.D. Mich.)** | **Van Sweden Jewelers, Inc. v. 101 VT, Inc., d/b/a Viachi, Vatche Keledjian and Vahe Keledjian**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) by faxing unsolicited advertisements. The “Settlement Class” is defined as follows: “All persons who were successfully sent one or more advertising facsimiles by or on behalf of the defendants, on or about May 7 & 8, 2007.”   | **7-29-2015** | **For more information write to:****Brian J. Wanca****Anderson + Wanca****3701 Algonquin Road****Suite 760****Rolling Meadows, IL 60008** |
| **4-8-2015** | **12-MD-02409** | **(D. Mass.)** | **In re: Nexium (Esomeprazole Magnesium) Antitrust Litigation**Direct-end-payor-plaintiffs allege that Defendants Dr. Reddy’s Laboratories, Ltd. and Dr. Reddy’s Laboratories, Inc. (collectively, “DRL”), and Teva, violated federal antitrust laws by unlawfully delaying the introduction of generic versions of the prescription drug Nexium into the U.S. markets, causing injury to Plaintiffs and members of the Direct Purchaser Class by causing them to pay higher prices for Nexium. The Class Period for Direct Purchasers is from 8-27-2008 to 12-11-2013 and for End-Payors is from 4-14-2008 through and until the anticompetitive effects of Defendants’ unlawful conduct cease. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.garwingerstein.com**](http://www.garwingerstein.com)[**www.bergermontague.com**](http://www.bergermontague.com)[**www.hbsslaw.com**](http://www.hbsslaw.com) |
| **4-8-2015** | **13-CV-4634** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Eliastam, et al. v. NBCUniversal Media, LLC**Unpaid-intern-plaintiffs allege that Defendant violated the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”) and the New York Labor Law by not classifying individuals who participated in unpaid internships (“Unpaid Interns”) as employees and failing to pay them the requisite minimum wages. The Named Plaintiff subsequently amended the Complaint to include allegations that Defendant violated the state wage and hour laws of California and Connecticut. The three (3) Class Periods: (1) from 7-3-2007 to 12-15-2015 for Unpaid Internships in New York; and (2) from 2-4-2010 to 12-15-2014 for Unpaid Internships in California or Connecticut. | **5-4-2015** | **For more information write or call:****Justin M. Swartz****Outten & Golden LLP****3 Park Avenue****29th Floor****New York, NY 10016****212 245-1000 (Ph.)** |
| **4-9-2015** | **13-CV-02223** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Garibaldi v. Bank of America, N.A.**Employee-plaintiff alleges that Bank of America should have paid for the time employees spent traveling between bank locations during the work day. Plaintiff also claims that when employees missed a meal break as a result of this travel, they should have been compensated. In addition, Plaintiff claims they should have been reimbursed for the travel costs they incurred in traveling between locations on a single day. The Class Period is from 10-2008 to 12-2014. | **8-15-2015** | **For more information write, email or call:****Chris Baker****Baker & Schwartz, P.C.****44 Montgomery Street****Suite 3520****San Francisco, CA 94104****cbaker@bakerlp.com** |
| **4-10-2015** | **13-CV-00095** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Mary Loeza, et al. v. JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.**Employee-plaintiffs filed a complaint against Chase alleging claims under California law and the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”) for alleged unpaid overtime based on off-the-clock work, meal/rest period violations, inaccurate wage statements, failure to pay wages twice monthly, unreimbursed business expenses, waiting time penalties, and unfair competition, on behalf of a putative class of LM Underwriter Jrs. in California. The Class Period is from 12-11-2008 to preliminary approval date. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****David R. Markham, Esq.****Peggy J. Reali, Esq.****The Markham Law Firm****750 B Street****Suite 1920****San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **4-10-2015** | **13-CV-4036** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Ballinger, et al. v. Advance Magazine Publishers Inc. d/b/a Condé Nast Publications**Intern-plaintiffs allege that Condé Nast violated wage and hour laws with respect to its interns by failing to pay them at least minimum wage and overtime. The Class Period is from 6-13-2007 to date of preliminary approval. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or email:****Rachel Bien****Juno Turner****Outten & Golden LLP****3 Park Avenue****29th Floor****New York, NY 10016****212-245-1000 (Ph.)****rmb@outtengolden.com****jturner@outtengolden.com** |
| **4-10-2015** | **09-CV-3043** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Hart, et al. v. RCI Hospitality Holdings, Inc., et al.**Entertainer-plaintiffs brought suit against Rick’s Cabaret in New York. The main question in this lawsuit was whether the entertainers who worked at the Cabaret were properly classified independent contractors, or whether they should have been classified as employees. To date, the Court has determined that the entertainers should have been classified as employees, and that Rick’s Cabaret in New York violated the law by 1) failing to pay entertainers the minimum wage for every hour worked; 2) charging entertainers money, such as house fees; and 3) retaining a portion of the value of the tips. The Class Period is from 9-10-2005 to 10-31-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Nichols Kaster, PLLP****Attn: Anna P. Prakash****4600 IDS Center****80 South Eighth Street****Minneapolis, MN 55403** |
| **4-10-2015** | **14-CV-02942** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Able Home Health, LLC, et al., v. Air1 Wireless, Inc., et al.**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that they received an unsolicited facsimile advertisement and that the sending of that fax and others like it violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act, the Illinois Consumer Fraud Act and the Illinois common laws of conversion, private nuisance, and trespass to chattels. Plaintiffs sought to represent a class of persons to whom the Air1 Wireless Defendants allegedly sent unsolicited facsimile advertisements promoting the Sprint Defendants’ or the Air1 Wireless Defendants’ goods or services for sale. The Class Period is from 4-24-2010 to 4-24-2014. | **8-18-2015** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Edelman, Combs, Latturner** **& Goodwin, LLC****20 S. Clark Street****Suite 1500****Chicago, IL 60603****312 739-4200 (Ph.)****312 419-0379 (Fax)** |
| **4-13-2015** | **12-MD-02311****13-CV-00703****13-CV-01103****13-CV-01403****13-CV-01503****13-CV-01803****13-CV-02003****13-CV-02203****13-CV-02503****13-CV-02603** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Alternators****In re: Starters****In re: Ignition Coils****In re: Motor Generators****In re: Inverters****In re: Air Flow Meters****In re: Fuel Injection Systems****In re: Valve Timing Control Devices****In re: Electronic Throttle Bodies**End-payor-plaintiffs – Court has granted preliminary approval for In re: Alternators and In re: Starters. The Court has not ruled yet on preliminary approval in the remaining cases. | **4-9-2015** | **For more information call:****Craig P. Seebald****Counsel for Defendants****202 639-6585 (Ph.)** |
| **4-13-2015** | **12-CV-03297** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Bristol County Retirement System, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated v. Allscripts Healthcare Solutions, Inc., et al.**Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendants made false and misleading statements to investors regarding the success of Allscripts’ merger with Eclipsys Corporation, and in particular regarding the progress of Defendants’ efforts to integrate the two companies’ software products and personnel. Lead Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants’ financial guidance for 2012 did not have a reasonable basis, because of the undisclosed obstacles to product integration and discord within the Company. Finally, Lead plaintiffs allege that Defendant Shapiro sold 100,000 shares of Allscripts stock while in possession of material, nonpublic information, in violation of §20A of the Exchange Act. The Class Period is from 11-8-2010 to 4-26-2012. | **7-22-2015** | **For more information write to:****Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP****Theodore J. Pintar****655 West Broadway****Suite 1900****San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **4-14-2015** | **12-MD-02311****13-CV-00702****13-CV-01102****13-CV-01402****13-CV-01502****13-CV-01802****13-CV-02002****13-CV-02202****13-CV-02502****13-CV-02602** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Alternators****In re: Starters****In re: Ignition Coils****In re: Motor Generators****In re: Inverters****In re: Air Flow Meters****In re: Fuel Injection Systems****In re: Valve Timing Control Devices****In re: Electronic Throttle Bodies**Automobile-dealership-plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of the HIAMS Defendants’ participation in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, and/orstabilize prices, rig bids, allocate markets and customers for: (1) Alternators; (2) Starters; (3) Ignition Coils; (4) Motor Generators; (5) Inverters; (6) Fuel Injection Systems; (7) Valve Timing Control Systems; (8) Electronic Throttle Bodies; and (9) Air Flow Meters in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act and various State antitrust, unjust enrichment, and consumer protection laws as set forth in Automobile Dealership Plaintiffs’ Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint (collectively “Complaints”). The Class Period is from 1-1-2000 to 3-27-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Cuneo Gilbert & Laduca,** **LLP****507 C Street, N.E.****Washington, DC 20002****Barrett Law Group, P.A.****P.O. Box 927****404 Court Square****Lexington, MS 39095****Larson King, LLP****2800 Wells Fargo Place****30 East Seventh Street****St. Paul, Minnesota 55101** |
| **4-16-2015** | **11-CV-4521****11-CV-6087****11-CV-5519** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Segal, et al. v. Bitar, et al.****Lawson v. Full Tilt Poker LTD.****Jetha, et al. v. Filco, LTD., et al.**Memorandum of Law in support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement and Setting of Final Fairness Hearing. For more information see CAFA Notice dated 1-16-2015. | **4-24-2015** | **For more information write or call:****Thomas H. Burt****Wolf Haldenstein Adler** **Freeman & Herz LLP****270 Madison Avenue****New York, NY 10016****212 545-4600 (Ph.)** |
| **4-17-2015** | **12-CV-01623** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Questcor Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Securities Litigation**Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendants Questcor, Bailey, Mulroy, Cartt, Young, David J. Medeiros and Mitchell J. Blutt violated the Federal Securities Laws. Plaintiffs allege, among other things, that throughout the Class Period, Defendants issued false and misleading statements about the effectiveness of, and prospects for, Questcor’s sole product, Acthar, while simultaneously using Questcor’s cash to prop up the price of Questcor shares through the purchase of hundreds of millions of dollars of Questcor stock in the open market. As a result, Questcor’s stock traded at artificially inflated prices. The Class Period is from 4-4-2011 to 9-21-2011. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or visit:****Rick Nelson****Shareholder Relations****Robbins Geller Rudman &** **Dowd LLP****655 West Broadway****Suite 1900****San Diego, CA 92101****1-800-449-4900 (Ph.)**[**www.questcorsecuritieslitigation.com**](http://www.questcorsecuritieslitigation.com) |
| **4-20-2015** | **13-CV-00185** | **(D. Colo.)** | **Jack Weller, et al. v. HSBC Mortgage Services, Inc., et al.**Borrower-plaintiffs allege that when a borrower was required to have flood insurance for his or her 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), the HSBC Defendants would place flood insurance in a manner that enabled them to obtain an unauthorized benefit. The Plaintiffs also allege that the way in which Lender Placed Flood Insurance (LPFI) was obtained and placed caused the LPFI charges and the amount of coverage to be excessive. The Class Period is from 1-1-2007 to date of preliminary approval. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Peter A. Muhic****Kessler Topaz Meltzer &** **Check, LLP****280 King of Prussia Road****Radnor, PA 19087****Shanon J. Carson****Berger & Montague, P.C.****1622 Locust Street****Philadelphia, PA 19103** |
| **4-22-2015** | **07-CV-00312** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Celestica Inc. Securities Litigation**Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege in the Consolidated Class Action Complaint, that Defendants Celestica, Delaney and Puppi, as well as Onex Corporation (“Onex”) and Gerald W. Schwartz (“Schwartz”) (the “Former Defendants”) violated Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder by making false and misleading statements during the Class Period regarding Celestica’s financial condition; the adequacy of Celestica’s internal financial and reporting controls; and the success and status of Celestica’s operating restructuring in its Mexico facilities. The Complaint further alleges that Class Members purchased or acquired Celestica common stock during the Class Period at artificially inflated prices and were damaged thereby. The Class Period is from 1-27-2005 to 1-30-2007.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Thomas A. Dubbs****James W. Johnson****Labaton Sucharow LLP****140 Broadway****New York, NY 10005** |
| **4-22-2015** | **11-CV-8066** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Oklahoma Police Pension and Retirement Systems v. U.S. Bank National Association**Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges claims against U.S. Bank as the trustee of the covered Trusts. Plaintiff alleges, among other things, (i) that mortgage files for the mortgage loans owned by the Covered Trusts lacked certain documentation, and that Defendant failed to take appropriate steps to enforce the Covered Trusts’ rights to obtain the documentation or to have such mortgage loans repurchased or replaced by the entities (or their successors) that sold the loans to the covered Trusts; (ii) that mortgage loans owned by the Covered Trusts breached representations and warranties made by the entities that sold the loans to the Covered Trust, and that Defendant failed to take appropriate steps to enforce the Covered Trusts’ rights to have such breaches cured or to have such loans repurchased or replaced by those entities (or their successors); and (iii) that Defendant failed to provide notice to holders of Notes issued by the Covered Trusts that the servicer of the mortgage loans, and others, allegedly had defaulted on their obligations to take appropriate steps to obtain cures of documentation problems or of breaches of representations and warranties, or to obtain repurchases or replacements of the affected loans. Plaintiff alleges claims for breaches of the contracts that govern the covered Trusts (called Indentures) and for violation of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939. The Class Period is based on whether the Notes were purchased or otherwise acquired from any of the following residential mortgage-backed securities trusts: Bear Stearns Arm Trust Series 2005-2, Bear Stearns Arm Trust Series 2005-5, Bear Stearns Arm Trust Series 2005-7, Bear Stearns Arm Trust Series 2005-9, and Bear Stearns Arm Trust Series 2006-1 (collectively, the “Covered Trusts”). | **7-24-2015** | **For more information write to:****Deborah Clark-Weintraub****Max R. Schwartz****Scott+Scott, Attorneys At** **Law, LLP****The Chrysler Building****405 Lexington Avenue****40th Floor****New York, NY 10174** |
| **4-23-2015** | **13-CV-01300** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Biolase, Inc. Securities Litigation**Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that Biolase, Inc. (“BIOLASE” or the “Company”), Federico Pignatelli, Frederick Furry, and Dr. Alexander Arrow (collectively, the “Defendants”)violated Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by misrepresenting and omitting material facts about, among other things, the growth of, and demand for BIOLASE’s WaterLase dental laser systems, and BIOLASE’s Class Period liquidity. Lead Plaintiff also alleges that the false and misleading statements and omissions resulted in the artificial inflation of the price of BIOLASE common stock. The Class Period is from 11-5-2012 to 8-13-2013. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Bernstein Liebhard LLP****Jeffrey M. Haber****Joseph R. Seidman, Jr.****10 East 40th Street****New York, NY 10016** |
| **4-24-2015** | **13-MD-2426****11-CV-00091****11-CV-00091** | **(D. Me.)** | **TRS Recovery Services, Inc. and TeleCheck Services, Inc.****LaRocque v. TRS Rocovery, Services, Inc., et al.****Allen v. TRS Recovery Services, Inc., et al.**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Defendant TRS’s form collection letter known as the “RECR3 letter” was unlawful. Specifically, the claim is that the RECR3 letter violated the federal Fair Debt Collection Act (FDCPA) because it was misleading and deceptive in (a) stating that TRS will create a paper draft and submit it to a consumer’s bank, when it has no authority to do so, and (b) referring to “any applicable state tax” without explaining or setting forth the amount of any tax. The Class Period is from 3-11-2010 to present. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Francis & Mailman, P.C.****James A. Francis****100 S. Broad Street****19th Floor****Philadelphia, PA 19110****215 735-8000 (Ph.)****1 800 735-8600 (Ph.)****Lewis Saul & Associates,** **P.C.****183 Middle Street****Suite 200****Portland, ME 04101****207 874-7404 (Ph.)** |
| **4-24-2015** | **13-CV-09116** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **In re: National Collegiate Athletic Association Student-Athlete Concussion Injury Litigation**Plaintiffs filed their Third Amended Class Action Complaint on 1-7-2015 (Dkt #119), and the NCAA answered the Third Amended Class Action Complaint on 1-28-2015 (Dkt. #131). On 4-14-2015, Class Counsel moved for leave to file Plaintiffs’ Fourth Amended Class Action Complaint (Dkt. #147) to include additional class representatives. Leave to file the Fourth Amended Class Action Complaint was granted by the Court on 4-17-2015 (Dkt. #169), and Plaintiffs filed their Fourth Amended Class Action Complaint (Dkt. #171) on 4-20-2015. There is a currently-proposed Settlement Agreement and an agreement (submitted to the court under seal) providing for a limit on opt outs. The Class Period is from 1960 to 2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Mark S. Mester****Latham & Watkins LLP****330 North Wabash Avenue****Suite 2800****Chicago, IL 60611****1 312 876-7700 (Ph.)****1 312 993-9767 (Fax)**  |
| **4-24-2015** | **11-CV-01613****12-CV-1602****12-CV-3059** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Rick James, et al. v. UMG Recordings, Inc.****Martha Davis, et al. v. Capitol Records, LLC****Ralph Vierra Tavares, et al. v. Capitol Records, LLC, et al.**Claimant-plaintiffs allege that under certain contracts, the Defendants did not properly calculate royalties or credit artists, producers, or other contracting parties for digital downloads, mastertones, and, as to Capitol US Labels, streams of recordings. The Plaintiffs claim that exploitations of digital downloads, mastertones, and streams should be treated as “licenses” rather than “sales” of records. The Class Period is from 1-1—2008 to 6-30-2011. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Pearson, Simon & Warshaw,** **LLP****15165 Ventura Boulevard****Suite 400****Sherman Oaks, CA 91403****818 788-8300 (Ph.)** |
| **4-27-2015** | **06-CV-01797** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **King Drug Co. of Florence, Inc. et al. v. Cephalon, Inc., et al.**Director purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated federal antitrust laws by engaging in an unlawful scheme to delay or block the market entry of less expensive, generic versions of Provigil®. The Direct Purchaser Class Plaintiffs allege that Cephalon entered into a series of unlawful, non-competition agreements, or horizontal market allocation agreements, with its prospective generic competitors, Defendants Teva, Barr, Mylan and Ranbaxy (collectively the “Generic Defendants”), whereby Cephalon agreed to pay the Generic Defendants, in exchange for agreements by the Generic Defendants to delay sale of their generic versions of Provigil. The Direct Purchaser Class Plaintiffs also allege that Cephalon committed Walker Process fraud in obtaining U.S. Patent No. RE 37.561 (“RE 561 patent”) and then sought to enforce a fraudulently obtained patent to delay the market entry of generic versions of Provigil. The Class Period is from 6-24-2006 to 8-31-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Bruce E. Gerstein****Garwin Gerstein & Fisher** **LLP****88 Pine Street****10th Floor****New York, NY 10005****212 398-0055 (Ph.)****212 764-6620 (Fax)** |
| **4-29-2015** | **13-CV-1091** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **Murr v. Capital One Bank (USA), N.A.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Capital One Bank (USA) N.A.’s policies and practices relating to certain interest and minimum payment charges after a credit card customer uses a 0% Access Check or No-Hassle Check are deceptive, constitute a breach of contract, and violate the Truth in Lending Act, including the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009. The Class Period is from 8-1-2008 to 1-2-2015. | **6-26-2015** | **For more information write to:****Timothy G. Blood****Thomas J. O’Reardon II****Blood Hurst & O’Reardon,** **LLP****701 B Street****Suite 1700****San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **4-30-2015** | **14-CV-314** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Cooper v. Nelnet, Inc.**Supplemental Notice – the Court has scheduled a Final Approval Hearing, for more information see CAFA Notice dated 12-12-2014.  | **7-15-2015** | **For more information write or call:****Scott D. Owens****664 E. Hallandale Beach** **Blvd.****Hallandale, FL 33009****954 589-0588 (Ph.)** |