| **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4-3-2017** | **14-CV-01278** | **(W.D. Pa.)** | **Jahoda, et al. v. Redbox Automated Retail, LLC**  The lawsuit asserts that Redbox Automated Retail, LLC (“Redbox”) violated federal law under the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq., by offering video and video game rental services at self-service, touch screen kiosks that are not fully accessible to, and independently usable by, blind and visually-impaired people. | **7-6-2017** | **For more inforamtion write or e-mail:**  **Benjamin J. Sweet**  **Carlson Lynch Sweet &**  **Kilpela, LLP**  **1133 Penn Avenue**  **5th Floor**  **Pittsburgh, PA 15222**  [**www.carlsonlynch.com**](http://www.carlsonlynch.com) |
| **4-3-2017** | **14-CV-0119** | **(M.D. Tenn.)** | **Krystek v. Ruby Tuesday, Inc. James J. Buettgen, Michael O. More, and Kimberly S. Grant**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated §§10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) by engaging in a fraudulent course of conduct that misled investors about the financial condition of the Company’s Lime Fresh Mexican Grill (“Lime Fresh”) chain and about the progress of the Company’s repositioning plan. | **8-7-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN**  **& DOWD LLP**  **DARREN J. ROBBINS**  **LAURIE L. LARGENT**  **655 West Broadway**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **4-3-2017** | **12-CV-08388** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Vargas, et al. v. Ford Motor Company**  Plaintiffs allege that the PowerShift Transmission in Class Vehicles was defectively designed and manufactured by Ford, causing it to slip, buck, kick, and/or jerk, resulting in the sudden or delayed acceleration of the vehicle. Plaintiffs have asserted nationwide claims under federal and state express and implied warranty laws and under consumer protection statutes. | **Not set yet**  Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more information write to:**  **Capstone Law APC**  **1875 Century Park E.**  **Suite 1000**  **Los Angeles, CA 90067** |
| **4-5-2017** | **15-CV-01970** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Resonant Inc., Securities Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Terry Lingren and John Philpott**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants knew that the public documents and statements issued or disseminated in the name of the Company were materially false and/or misleading; knew that such statements or documents would be issued or disseminated to the investing public; and knowingly and substantially participated or acquiesced in the issuance or dissemination of such statements or documents as primary violations of the federal securities laws. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **The Rosen Law Firm, P.A.**  **Laurence M. Rosen**  **355 S. Grand Avenue**  **Suite 2450**  **Los Angeles, CA 90071**  **213 785-2610 (Ph.)**  **213 226-4684 (Fax)**  [**Irosen@rosenlegal.com**](mailto:Irosen@rosenlegal.com) |
| **4-6-2017** | **12-CV-2274** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Jaenean Ligon, et al. v. The City of New York, et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment rights of the plaintiffs class because of the way the New York City Police Department ("NYPD") has conducted stops and frisks over the past decade (the "Liability Opinion"). In an opinion issued in January 2013, it was found that the Ligon plaintiffs, representing a putative class of people stopped outside buildings participating in the Trespass Affidavit Program (“TAP”) in the Bronx, were entitled to preliminary injunctive relief based on violations of their Fourth Amendment rights. | **6-6-2017** | **For more information write or call:**  **Christopher Dunn**  **Molly Kovel**  **Jordan Wells**  **New York Civil Liberties**  **Union**  **125 Broad Street**  **19th Floor**  **New York, NY 10004**  **212 607-3300 (Ph.)** |
| **4-7-2017** | **14-MD-02541** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: National Collegiate Athletic Association Athletic Grant-in-Aid Cap Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Pac-12 Conference, The Big Ten Conference, Inc., The Big 12 Conference, Inc., Southeastern Conference, Atlantic Coast Conference, American Athletic Conference, Conference USA, Mid-American Athletic Conference, Inc., Mountain West Conference, Sun Belt Conference, and Western Athletic Conference**  Plaintiffs include current and former student-athletes that have challenged the NCAA’s former rules capping athletically related financial aid packages for student-athletes, arguing new rules allow for athletically related aid up to the full cost of attendance. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants conspired to suppress competition by agreeing to and enforcing restrictive NCAA bylaws that cap the amount of athletically related financial aid and other benefits to student athletes. | **11-17-2017** | **For more information visit:**  [**WWW.GrantInAidSettlement.COM**](http://WWW.GrantInAidSettlement.COM) |
| **4-7-2017** | **14-CV-5556** | **(D.N.J.)** | **In Re: Enzymotec Ltd. Securities Litigation**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated federal securities law under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 10b-5 on behalf of purchasers of the Company’s common stock during a purported Class Period between 9-27- 2013 to 8-4-2014, inclusive. The Litigation also includes a second set of claims against the Securities Act Defendants, alleging violations of Sections 11, 12 and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 on behalf of purchasers of Enzymotec shares pursuant and/or traceable to the Company’s IPO and the Company’s SPO. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Carella, Byrne,**  **Cecchi, Olstein,**  **Brody & Agnello,P.C.**  **James E. Cecchi**  **5 Becker Farm Road**  **Roaeland, NJ 07068**  **973 994-1700 (Ph.)** |
| **4-7-2017** | **14-CV-02081** | **(E.D. Cal.)** | **Fellen, Inc., et al. v. RehabCare Group, Inc., et al.**  Plaintiff alleges that RehabCare and Polaris violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 (“TCPA”), by sending unsolicited facsimile advertisements that do not comply with the TCPA’s opt-out notice requirements. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Payne & Fears LLP**  **C. Darryl Cordero**  **Scott O. Luskin**  **Matthew K. Brown**  **Leilani E. Livingston**  **1100 Glendon Avenue**  **Suite 1250**  **Los Angeles CA 90024**  **310 689-1750 (Ph.)**  **310 689-1755 (Fax)** |
| **4-10-2017** | **16-CV-02758** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Third Avenue Management LLC Securities Litigation**  Plaintiffs allege that the Initial public offering documents for the continuous offering of the Fund’s shares negligently misrepresented and omitted material information about the Fund and its assets. More specifically, Plaintiffs allege that: (i) the Fund’s Registration Statement misrepresented the liquidity of the Fund’s assets, which Plaintiffs assert contained illiquid holdings in an amount greater than the Fund’s purported 15% restriction on such holdings and parallel U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) guidance; (ii) the Fund misrepresented the shareholders’ ability to redeem shares in light of the Fund’s insufficient liquidity and the substantial amount of redemptions that could force the Fund to suspend redemptions; (iii) the Fund inaccurately marketed itself as a “highyield” fund, when it was actually a “highly illiquid distressed debt fund”; (iv) the Fund misrepresented Defendants’ ability to properly value securities because the Fund did not properly identify illiquid securities or take into account the illiquid nature of its assets when determining their values; (v) the Fund’s Registration Statement contained false and misleading sworn certifications; and (vi) the Fund did not comply with the SEC’s requirement in Form N-1A that mutual fund prospectuses disclose the principal risks of investing in the Fund. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN**  **& DOWD LLP**  **JEFFREY D. LIGHT**  **655 West Broadway Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **4-10-2017** | **13-CV-03258** | **(D. Colo.)** | **Wornicki, et al. v. Brokerpriceopinion.com, Inc., et al.**  Plaintiffs brought this lawsuit alleging that Defendants breached contractual agreements with real estate brokers and were unjustly enriched by failing to pay brokers for broker price opinions in accordance with their payment terms. The lawsuit seeks payment for broker price opinions that brokers performed on behalf of Defendants. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Beth E. Terrell**  **Jennifer Rust Murray**  **Terrell Marshall Law Group**  **PLLC**  **936 North 34th Street**  **Suite 300**  **Seattle, Washington 98103**  **206 816-6603 (Ph.)**  **206 350-3528 (Fax)** |
| **4-10-2017** | **12-MD-02311** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Toyoda Gosei Co., Ltd., Toyoda Gosei North America Corporation, TG Kentucky, LLC, and TG Fluid Systems USA Corporation (collectively, “Toyoda Gosei”) Hitachi Metals, Ltd., Hitachi Metals America, Ltd., and Hitachi Cable America, Inc. and unnamed co-conspirators, manufacturers and/or suppliers of Automotive Brake Hoses**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants and their co-conspirators agreed, combined, and conspired to fix, raise, maintain and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate the market and customers in the United States for automotive brake hoses. According to the U.S. 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**  **4725 Wisconsin Avenue, NW**  **Suite 200**  **Washington, DC 20016** |
| **4-12-2017** | **12-MD-2503** | **(D. Mass.)** | **In re: Soldyn A (Minocycline Hydrochloride) Antitrust Litigation**  The Plaintiffs argue that this alleged conduct suppressed or eliminated competition that Medicis would have faced from generic competitors. The Plaintiffs further claim that Class Members were injured as a result of the Defendants’ acts by paying more for Solodyn and/or generic Solodyn than they would have paid otherwise and/or by being unable to purchase less expensive, generic versions of Solodyn. As a result, the Plaintiffs claim that Class Members were overcharged for Solodyn and its generic versions. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**  [**www.SolodynDirectPurchaserAntitrustLitigation.com**](http://www.SolodynDirectPurchaserAntitrustLitigation.com) |
| **4-13-2017** | **13-CV-00453** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Opperman v. Kong Technologies, Inc.**  This lawsuit involves several coordinated cases brought against several companies that developed Apps for Apple iOS devices (iPhone, IPad, or IPod Touch), and alleges that certain versions of the Foodspotting, Foursquare, Gowalla, Instagram, Kik, Path, Twitter, and Yelp Apps obtained contact data from users’ iOS devices in violation of user’s privacy rights, and that Apple aided and abetted that conduct. The lawsuit also alleges that Apple misrepresented the privacy and safety of its iOS devices. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Kerr & Wagstaffe LLP**  **101 Mission Street**  **18th Floor**  **San Francisco, CA 94105**  **Gardy & Notis, LLP**  **501 Fifth Avenue**  **Suite 1408**  **New York, NY 10017** |
| **4-14-2017** | **15-CV-00027** | **(N.D. W.Va.)** | **Diana Mey v. Patriot Payment Group, LLC, et al.**  **Re Defendants: Patriot Payments, LLC and North American Bancard, LLC**  Plaintiff alleges that, on or after 2-27-2011, Defendants violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) by making calls to cellular telephones through the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and to telephone numbers that were listed on the National Do-Not-Call Registry. The class representative alleges that Defendants did not have the recipients’ permission to make these calls. | **7-26-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **John W. Barrett**  **Jonathan R. Marshall**  **BAILEY & GLASSER LLP**  **209 Capitol Street**  **Charleston, WV 25301**  **Edward Broderick**  **Anthony Paronich**  **BRODERICK & PARONICH, P.C.**  **99 High St., Suite 304**  **Boston, Massachusetts 02110** |
| **4-14-2017** | **14-CV-8925** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re Salix Pharmaceuticals, Ltd.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, and against the Individual Defendants under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. The Complaint included the City of Fort Lauderdale General Employees’ Retirement System (“Fort Lauderdale“) as an additional named plaintiff. The Complaint alleged that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements about Salix’s “wholesale inventory levels.” The Complaint alleged that the price of Salix common stock was artificially inflated during the Class Period as a result of Defendants’ allegedly false and misleading statements, and declined significantly when the truth was revealed. The Complaint alleged that the prices of Salix Options were also distorted as the result of the artificially inflated price of Salix common stock, and that investors who purchased Salix Call Options or sold Salix Put Options during the Class Period were damaged when the truth was revealed. | **7-24-2017** | **For more information visit or write:**  [**www.SalixSecuritiesLitigation.com**](http://www.SalixSecuritiesLitigation.com)  **Bernstein Litowitz Berger**  **& Grossmann LLP**  **Salvatore J. Graziano**  **1251 Avenue of the Americas 44th Floor**  **New York, NY 10020** |
| **4-14-2017** | **15-CV-00101** | **(N.D.W. Va.)** | **Diana Mey v. Got Warranty, Inc., et al.**  **Re Defendants: Got Warranty, Inc., N.C.W.C., Inc., Palmer Administrative Services, Inc., and Ganna Freiberg**  The lawsuit alleges that the Defendants made telemarketing calls in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 (the “TCPA”). | **7-26-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **John W. Barrett**  **BAILEY & GLASSER LLP**  **209 Capitol Street**  **Charleston WV 25301** |
| **4-17-2017** | **12-CV-00376** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Allen, et al. v. Similasancorp.**  The lawsuit claims Similasan Corporation’s labels and marketing for its homeopathic products was false and deceptive. | **7-8-2017** | **For more information visit or call:**  [**www.SimilasanClassAction.com**](http://www.SimilasanClassAction.com)  **1 855 974-6452 (Ph.)** |
| **4-17-2017** | **17-CV-11109** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Heather Control Panels (Direct Purchaser Action)**  **Re Defendants: Alps Electric Co., Ltd., Alps Electric (North America), Inc., and Alps Automotive Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that Alps violated federal antitrust laws by participating in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix maintain, and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for heater control panels. | **Not set yet** | **For more informtion write or call:**  **Eugene A. Spector**  **William G. Caldes**  **Jonathan M. Jagher**  **Spector Roseman Kodroff &**  **Willis, P.C.**  **1818 Market Street**  **Suite 2500**  **Philadelphia, PA 19103**  **215 496-0300 (Ph.)** |
| **4-18-2017** | **14-CV-12245** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Charles Leach v. Honeywell International, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that TrueSTEAM Humidifiers were defectively designed and manufactured and deceptively marketed, primarily in relation to the alleged effects of mineral scale and sediment build-up on the units. | **9-7-2017** | **For more information write, call:**  **Robert K. Shelquist**  **LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN**  **P.L.L.P.**  **100 Washington Avenue South, Suite 2200**  **Minneapolis, MN 55401-2159**  **612 339-6900 (Ph.)** |
| **4-18-2017** | **12-MD-02311**  **16-CV-10461**  **16-CV-02503** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation, Interior Trim Products (End-Payor Action)**  **Re Defendants: INOAC Group North America, LLC and INOAC USA Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of INOAC’s participation in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for interior trim products in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act and various state antitrust, unfair competition, unjust enrichment, and consumer protection laws. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Cotchett, Pitre, &**  **McCarthy LLP**  **840 Malcolm Road**  **Burlingame, CA 94010**  **Robins Kaplan LLP**  **601 Lexington Avenue**  **Suite 3400**  **New York, NY 10022** |
| **4-20-2-17** | **16-CV-00714** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **Tiffany Smith v. Sterling Infosystems-Ohio, Inc., Sterling Infosystems, Inc., and e-Verifile.com, Inc.**  This lawsuit alleges that e-Verifile did not comply with the Fair Credit Reporting Act in the manner in which it obtained, relied upon and/or issued background reports of job applicants. Plaintiff further alleges that e-Verifile obtained, relied upon and/or issued background reports without permission. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call:**  **O’Toole McLaughlin Dooley & Pecora, Co. LPA,**  **440 930-4001 (Ph.)**  **Law Offices of**  **John C. Bazaz, PLC**  **703 272-8455 (Ph.)** |
| **4-20-2017** | **14-CV-06305** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Antonette Jones v. First Quality Enterprises, Inc., First Quality Consumer Products, LLC, Nutek Disposable, Inc., Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., Family Dollar Stores, Inc., Walgreen Co., dba Walgreens, and Fred’s Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants sold, manufactured, distributed, or marketed certain Baby Wipes products that may have been contaminated with the bacteria, Burkholderia cepacia, which allegedly caused certain users to suffer skin infections or irritation, bacterial genitourinary tract infections, or other symptoms. Affected brand names include: Cuties, Diapers.com, Fred’s, Kidgets, Member’s Mark, Simply Right, Sunny Smiles, Tender Touch, and Well Beginnings, as well as feminine wipes manufactured under the Femtex brand. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Jasper D. Ward**  **JONES WARD PLC**  **The Pointe**  **1205 E Washington Street, Suite 111**  **Louisville, Kentucky 40206** |
| **4-20-2017** | **16-CV-00157** | **(E.D. Cal.)** | **McCulloch, et al. v. Baker Hughes Inteq Drilling Fluids, Inc., Baker Hughes Inc., et al.**  Plaintiff alleges that Baker Hughes misclassified consultant directional drillers as independent contractors rather than employees and failed to pay overtime premiums for overtime hours worked. Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to provide meal and rest breaks, accurate written wage statements, and failed to timely pay all final wages to California Class Members. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **DANIEL BROME**  **NICHOLS KASTER LLP**  **235 Montgomery Street Suite 810**  **San Francisco, CA 94104**  **415 277-7235 (Ph.)** |
| **4-21-2017** | **14-CV-01395**  **14-CV-1395**  **14-CV-1398**  **14-CV-1403**  **14-CV-29**  **14-CV-1474** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **In re: Rayonier Inc. Securities Litigation**  **Sating v. Rayonier Inc.**  **Keasler v. Rayonier Inc.**  **Lake Worth Firefighters’ Pension Trust Fund v.**  **Rayonier Inc.**  **Christie v. Rayonier Inc.**  **Brown v. Rayonier Inc.**  The Complaint alleges claims on behalf of purchasers of Rayonier common stock from 10-26-2010, through 11-7-2014, against all Defendants under Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, and against the Individual Defendants under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. The Complaint alleges that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements about Rayonier’s harvesting practices, its reported merchantable timber inventory, and certain financial results. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Bernstein Litowitz**  **Berger & Grossmann LLP**  **David R. Stickney**  **12481 High Bluff Drive**  **Suite 300**  **San Diego, CA 92130** |
| **4-21-2017** | **15-CV-00393** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **Sohal v. Yan, et al.**  **Re Defendants: Ellis Yan, TCP International Holding, Ltd., Brian Catlett, Deutsche Securities, Inc., Piper Jaffray & Co., Canaccord Genuity Inc., and Cowen and Company, LLC (the “Underwriter Defendants”)**  Lead Plaintiff City of Warren Police & Fire Retirement System alleges claims for violations of Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”), and Rule 10b-5 against TCPI, Ellis Yan and Brian Catlett (the “TCPI Defendants”) on behalf of all persons or entities who purchased or otherwise acquired TCPI common stock during the Class Period. Lead Plaintiff also alleges claims for violations of Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”) against the TCPI Defendants and the underwriters of TCPI’s 6-25-2014 initial public offering, Deutsche Bank Securities Inc., the Underwriter Defendants on behalf of all persons or entities that purchased the common stock of TCPI pursuant or traceable to the registration Statement for TCPI’s 6-25-2014 initial public offering. | **8-1-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **Ellen Gusikoff Stewart**  **Robbins Geller Rudman**  **& Dowd LLP**  **655 West Broadway**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **4-21-2017** | **15-CV-07350** | **(D.N.J.)** | **In re: Amicus Therapeutics, Inc. Securities Litigation**  **Re Defendants: John F. Crowley and Jay A. Barth**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements to Amicus investors in violation of Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended by the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, 15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b), 78t(a), and rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-6 (the “Exchange Act”), on behalf of a class of purchasers of the Company’s common stock between 9-15-2015 and 10-1-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**  [**www.AmicusSecuritiesLitigation.com**](http://www.AmicusSecuritiesLitigation.com) |
| **4-24-2017** | **15-CV-01668** | **(S.D. Tex.)** | **In re: CBD Energy Limited Securities Litigation**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated federal securities laws by making material misrepresentations or omissions concerning undisclosed self-dealing transactions entered into by CBD’s President Gerard McGowan and inflated financial results as reported CBD’s SEC filings. The Securities Act Amended Complaint and the Exchange Act allege that the misstatements and/or omissions artificially inflated the price of CBD common stock, and that the share prices dropped in response to certain subsequent disclosures. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Phillip Kim**  **THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.**  **275 Madison Avenue**  **34th Floor**  **New York, New York 10016** |
| **4-24-2017** | **16-CV-00825** | **(D. Colo.)** | **Ross v. Convergent Outsourcing Inc., et al.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (“FDCPA”), 15 U.SC. §1692e, et seq., for being false, deceptive or misleading and §1692f unfair or unconscionable collection practice against plaintiff. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that on 4-13-2015 Convergent sent a collection letter regarding a debt arising from a personal Capital One credit card. Plaintiff alleged that the Letter has “the capacity to mislead the least sophisticated consumer as to the character of the debt or its enforceability.” Plaintiff further alleged that “continuing to send collection letters on a debt over fifteen years old is, per se unfair or unconscionable where the applicable statute of limitation is only six years. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **DavidN.McDevitt**  **Russell S. Thompson, IV**  **Thompson Consumer Law**  **Group, PLLC**  **5235 E. Southern Avenue**  **Mesa, AZ 85206**  **602 845-5969 (Ph.)**  **866 317-2674 (Fax)** |
| **4-24-2017** | **05-CV-1070**  **05-CV-1073**  **05-CV-7821**  **06-CV-3924**  **05-CV-1172**  **06-CV-5060** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Terri N. White, et al. v. Experian Information**  **Solutions, Inc.**  **Terri N. White, et al. v. TransUnion LLC**  **Terri N. White, et al. v. Equifax Information**  **Services LLC**  **Jose Hernandez, et al. v. Equifax Information**  **Services, et al.**  **Dennis Pike v. Equifax Information Services LLC**  **et al.**  **Jose L. Acosta, Jr., et al. v. TransUnion LLC**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act (“FCRA”) and related state laws by failing to follow reasonable procedures to assure maximum possible accuracy in the reporting of debts discharged in bankruptcy and failing to properly reinvestigate disputes made by consumers regarding such debts. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants were erroneously reporting those kinds of debts as “in collection” or “due and owing” on their credit reports, when they should have been reported as included in bankruptcy, and that when consumers disputed such reporting, Defendants failed to properly investigate such disputes. Plaintiffs allege in the lawsuit that a credit report contained an “error” if an account or judgment which was discharged in a Chapter 7 bankruptcy was reported with information indicating that such debt was due and owing. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Michael W. Sobol**  **Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann &**  **Bernstein, LLP**  **275 Battery Street**  **30th Floor**  **San Francisco, CA 94111** |
| **4-25-2017** | **12-CV-00101** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **In re: Wire Harness**  **Chiyoda Manufacturing Corporation (“Chiyoda”); Fujikura Ltd. and Fujikura Automotive America LLC (collectively, “Fujikura”); LEONI Wiring Systems, Inc. and Leonische Holding Inc. (collectively, “LEONI”); Sumitomo Electric**  **Industries, Ltd., Sumitomo Wiring Systems, Ltd., Sumitomo Electric Wiring Systems, Inc., K&S Wiring Systems, Inc., and Sumitomo Wiring**  **Systems (U.S.A.), Inc. (collectively, “Sumitomo”); and Yazaki Corporation and Yazaki North America, Inc. (collectively, “Yazaki”) (all defendants referenced in this paragraph collectively, the “Settling Defendants”).**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants entered into a conspiracy to suppress and eliminate competition for wire harness products by agreeing to rig bids for, and to raise, fix, stabilize, or maintain the prices of, Wire  Harness Products, in violation of federal antitrust laws. Plaintiffs further allege that because of the conspiracy, they and other direct purchasers of Wire Harness Products in the United States have been injured by paying more for those products than they would have paid in the absence of the alleged illegal conduct. | **8-8-2017** | **For more information visit:**  [**www.autopartsantitrustlitigation.com**](http://www.autopartsantitrustlitigation.com) |
| **4-26-2017** | **13-CV-02701** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **In re: Air Conditioning Systems**  **Re Defendants: Valeo, Inc., Valeo Electrical Systems, Inc., and Valeo Climate Control Corp.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants conspired to rig bids, and to fix, maintain, and/or stabilize the prices of air conditioning systems sold in the United States from at least as early as 1-1-2001 through the present. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants fraudulently concealed their conspiracy. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Melissa H. Maxman**  **Ronald F. Wick**  **COZEN O’CONNOR**  **1627 I Street, NW**  **Washington, D.C. 20006**  **202 912-4800 (Ph.)** |
| **4-25-2017** | **14-CV-03787** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Mata, et al. v. Manpower, Inc. California Peninsula, et al.**  Plaintiffs allege multiple violations of the California Labor Code, the California Business and Professions Code, and the California Private Attorneys General Act, including causes of action for: (1) failure to pay reporting time pay; (2) failure and refusal to pay agreed wages; (3) failure to apply wages due and payable after demand has been made; (4) failure to pay minimum wages; (5) knowing and intentional failure to comply with itemized employee wage statement provisions; (6) failure to pay wages timely; and (7) failure to pay all wages upon termination. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Fitzpatrick, Spini &**  **Swanston**  **555 S. Main Street**  **Salinas, CA 93905**  **1 855 755-1311 (Ph.)** |
| **4-27-2017** | **16-CV-11367** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **Elizabeth Moeller, et al. v. American Media, Inc., et al.**  This lawsuit claims that Defendants violated Michigan’s Preservation of Personal  Privacy Act, M.C.L. § 445.1712 (“PPPA”) by disclosing information related to its customers’ magazine subscriptions to third parties. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Jay Edelson**  **Edelson PC**  **350 North LaSalle St.**  **Suite 1300**  **Chicago, IL 60654** |
| **4-27-2017** | **14-CV-03998** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re Rocket Fuel Inc., Securities Litigation**  **Re Defendants: George H. John, Richard Frankel, and J. Peter Bardwick**  Plaintiffs alleged that during the Class Period, the defendants made false and misleading statements regarding Rocket Fuel’s ability to detect and combat ad fraud and its future business prospects. Lead Plaintiffs also alleged that the defendants made materially false and misleading statements in the registration statements and prospectuses for Rocket Fuel’s initial public offering in September 2013 and its secondary public offering in January 2014. Lead Plaintiffs alleged that the materially false and misleading statements artificially inflated the price of Rocket Fuel common stock, and that the price of Rocket Fuel’s common stock fell when the truth was partially revealed on 5-8-2014, and fell further when the truth was fully revealed on 8-5-2014, thus damaging the members of the Class. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Ramzi Abadou**  **KAHN SWICK & FOTI, LLP**  **912 Cole Street, #251**  **San Francisco, CA 94117**  **504 455-1400 (Ph.)**  **Laurence D. King**  **Mario M. Choi**  **KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER**  **LLP**  **350 Sansome Street**  **Suite 400**  **San Francisco, CA 94104**  **415 772-4700 (Ph.)** |
| **4-27-2017** | **07-CV-01757** | **(D.D.C.)** | **In re: Harman International Industries, Inc., Securities Litigation**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the federal securities laws by making materially false and misleading statements and/or omitting material information regarding actual and projected sales of the Company’s personal navigation devices (“PNDs”) in Europe. Lead Plaintiff further alleged that, as a result of the alleged misrepresentations and/or omissions by Defendants, the price of Harman common stock was artificially inflated during the Class Period and that when the truth about the Company’s PNDs was allegedly revealed (and the price of Harman common stock declined), Class Members suffered damages. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS &**  **TOLL PLLC**  **S. Douglas Bunch**  **1100 New York Avenue N.W.**  **Suite 500, East Tower**  **Washington, DC 20005** |
| **4-28-2017** | **15-CV-01848** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Joshua Rafofsky, et al. v. Nissan North America, Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that the InTouch system has failed to perform as advertised and represented by Nissan North America, Inc. and that it has not met their expectations or the expectations of other consumers. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Ben Barnow**  **Barnow and Associates,**  **P.C.**  **One North LaSalle Street, Suite 4600**  **Chicago, IL 60602** |
| **4-28-2017** | **14-CV-00081** | **(D. Md.)** | **Fangman, et al. v. Genuine Title, LLC, et al.**  **Re Defendant: West Town Bank & Trust**  Plaintiffs alleged that the Defendant Lenders, including certain employee of West Town, received marketing materials, postage, payments and/or other improper benefits from Genuine Title and its related companies in exchange for their agreement to refer business to Genuine Title. The Plaintiffs alleged that they and the members of the class of borrowers that they seek to represent currently have or had federally related mortgage loans originated or brokered. | **11-20-2017** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Michael Paul SmithSarah ZadroznySmith, Gildea**  **& Schmidt, LLC**  **600 Washington Avenue**  **Suite 200**  **Towson, MD 21204**  **410 821-0070 (Ph.)**  **410 821-0071 (Fax)** |
| **4-28-2017** | **15-CV-00912** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **Matthew Traxler, et al. v. PPG Industries, Inc., et al.**  Plaintiffs claim that the Rescue It! products contain design flaws that cause them to fail to adhere properly to the underlying decking or substrate, causing the Rescue It! Products to routinely peel, crack, and bubble, and cause damage to the property to which they are applied. | **8-23-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **MCCUNE WRIGHT AREVALO LLP**  **555 Lancaster Avenue**  **Berwyn, PA 19312**  **Attn: Joseph Sauder** |