|  **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name**  **Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **Website Link** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **8-3-2015** | **12-CV-04005** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Luis Rosado v. eBay, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that at certain times, Buy it Now (“BIN”) listings were delisted when a prospective buyer clicked the “BIN” button on a listing, and remained delisted even if the buyer did not complete payment and there was time remaining in the listing period. In such cases, Plaintiff alleges that eBay deprived class members of the full value of the listing. The Class Period is from 7-30-2008 to date of the Preliminary Approval Order. | **Not set yet** | Prepared by Brenda Berkley**For more information visit:**[**www.ebaysettlementwebsite.com**](http://www.ebaysettlementwebsite.com) |
| **8-3-2015** | **12-CV-000889** | **(D. Neb.)** | **Corona v. Habortouch Payments, LLC (formerly United Bankcard, Inc. d/b/a Harbortouch)**Merchant-plaintiff alleges that Harbortouch Payments, LLC (formerly United Bank Card, Inc. d/b/a Harbortouch) ("Harbortouch") charged an IRS Processing Validation Fee that its contracts with merchants do not authorize, that violate public policy and/or are in violation of anInternal Revenue Service rule, regulation, code, Frequently Asked Question and/or publication. The Class is described as all merchants in the U.S. that submitted a merchant application for credit or debit card processing to United Bank Card, Inc., d/b/a Harbortouch, prior to 2-1-2009, and that paid Harbortouch an IRS Processing Validation Fee. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:****Joel Ewusiak****Ewusiak Law, P.A.****100 Main Street****Suite 205****Safety Harbor, FL 34695****joel@ewusiaklaw.com** |
| **8-5-2015** | **14-CV-22264** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Dwight Wilson, et al. v. EverBank, et al.**Borrower-plaintiffs allege that when a borrower was required to have insurance for his or her property pursuant to a Residential mortgage or home equity loan or line of credit serviced by EverBank and evidence of acceptable coverage was not provided (for example, when the insurance policy did not exist or had lapsed), EverBank would place insurance in a manner such that EverBank allegedly received an unauthorized benefit. Plaintiffs allege further that Everbank did so primarily to receive alleged “kickbacks” in the form of commissions, profits under certain reinsurance agreements, or other alleged income or benefits. Plaintiffs also allege that the way in which Lender Placed Hazard Insurance policies were obtained and placed caused the rates and the amount of coverage to be excessive. The Class Period is from 1-1-2009 to date of Preliminary Approval Order. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, e-mail, call or fax:**Adam M. MoskowitzKozyak, Tropin, & Throckmorton, P.A.2525 Ponce de Leon Blvd.,9th FloorCoral Gables, FL 33134amm@kttlaw.com**(305) 372-1800 (Ph.)****(305) 372-3508 (Fax)** |
| **8-5-2015** | **06-CV-07023** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **In re: Sears and Co. Front-Loading Washer Products Liability Litigation, Roebuck** Purchaser-plaintiff alleges that Sears and Whirlpool breached express and implied warranties to purchasers and owners of the washing machines at issue and violated certain statutory rights as a result of alleged defects with the washers’ electronic control board or central control unit (CCU), that caused the machines to display error codes, cease operation and prevent the door lock mechanism from working properly. The washing machines at issue are: 1) Whirlpool Washer models called “Duet” or “Duet HT”, manufactured by Whirlpool between 5-25-2004 and 2-28-2006 with a model number beginning with GHW\* and a serial number beginning in the range CSR 22 – CSR53, CSS01 – CSS53, or CST01 – CST08; and 2) Kenmore Washer models called “HE3”, “HE3t”, or “HE4t”, manufactured by Whirlpool betw2een 6-8-2004 , and 2-28-2006, with a model number beginning with 110.45\* and a serial number beginning in the range CSR24 – CSR53, CSS01 – CSS53, or CST01 – CST08. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Chimicles & Tikellis LLP** **and Carey, Danis & Lowe****222 Delaware Ave** **Suite 1100****Wilmington, DE 19801****Danis & Lowe****8235 Forsyth Blvd****St. Louis, MO 63105** |
| **8-5-2015** | **10-MD-02196****10-MD-02019****10-CV-02089** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **In re: Polyurethane Foam Antitrust Litigation****Gomez v. Hickory Springs Manufacturing Co., et al.****Hudson, et al. v. Hickory Spring Mfg., Co., et al.****Beastrom, et al. v. Carpenter Co., et al.****Vicky’s Furniture v. Hickory Springs Mfg., Co., et al.**Indirect-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that certain manufacturers of flexible polyurethane foam, which is used in upholstered furniture, carpet underlay (also called carpet padding or carpet cushion), and bedding (for example, mattresses, mattress toppers, or pillows) conspired to raise the prices of flexible polyurethane foam. Plaintiffs contend that Defendants’ actions violated numerous States’ antitrust and consumer protection laws. The Class Period is from 1-1-1999 to present. | **12-15-2015** | **For more information visit or call:**[**www.polyfoamclassaction.com**](http://www.polyfoamclassaction.com)**866 302-7323 (Ph.)** |
| **8-6-2015** | **12-CV-00531** | **(D. Conn.)** | **3081 Main Street, LLC v. National Business Capital, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiff allegesthat National Business Capital, Inc. sent or caused to be sent facsimile advertisements to persons in the United States, which allegedly violated theTelephone Consumer Protection Act and related Federal Communications Commission Regulations. The Class Period is from 4-10-2008 to 4-10-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call or visit:****1 800 699-6964 (Ph.)**[**www.nationalbusinessclassaction.net**](http://www.nationalbusinessclassaction.net) |
| **8-6-2015** | **12-CV-08478** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: SinoHub Securities Litigation**Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that SinoHub and certain of its current and former officers and directors issued materially false and misleading public statements concerning: (1) SinoHub’s financial statements; (2) the Company’s internal controls; (3) the Company’s revenue; and (4) the success of SinoHub’s “ICM” (cell phone) business and alleges Baker Tilly Hong Kong Limited, the Company’s former auditor, knowingly or recklessly reviewed and certified flawed financial statements prepared by SinoHub. The Complaint further alleges that, as a direct and proximate result of the alleged false and misleading statements, the price of SinoHub’s stock was artificially inflated at the time it was purchased by Lead Plaintiff and the members of the Class and that, when the truth was revealed, the price of SinoHub’s stock collapsed, damaging Lead Plaintiff and the Class. The Class Period is from 5-17-2010 to 8-21-2015. | **11-13-2015** | **For more information write to:****SCOTT+SCOTT, ATTORNEYS AT** **LAW, LLP** **David R. Scott** **Joseph P. Guglielmo** **Amanda F. Lawrence** **The Chrysler Building** **405 Lexington Avenue, 40th Floor** **New York, NY 10174** |
| **8-6-2015** | **12-CV-207****14-CV-00162** | **(D. Conn.)** | **Joseph H. Carlone v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.****Pawel Bubel and MichaelShea, v. Progressive Causalty Ins. Co.**Employee-plaintiffs allege that Progressive Casualty Insurance Company (“Progressive”) misclassified Claims Generalist Associates (“CGA”) employees as exempt under federal and state overtime laws and failed to pay overtime pay for hours above 40 in a workweek. The Class Period is from 1-2012 to 1-2013.   | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Richard E. Hayber****Hayber Law Firm, LLC****221 Main Street****Suite 502****Hartford, CT 06106****860 522-8888 (Ph.)****rhayber@hayberlawfirm.com** |
| **8-6-2015** | **09-CV-00852** | **(E.D. Wis.)** | **Fond du Lac Bumper Exchange Inc. v. Jui Li Enterprise Co., Ltd., et al.**Indirect-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated state and federal antitrust laws and other state laws by agreeing to fix prices and limit the supply of Aftermarket Automotive Sheet Metal (“AMSM”) Products. AMSM Products include any and all aftermarket automotive parts made of any kind of sheet metal including, but not limited to, hoods, doors, bumpers, fenders, bonnets, floor panels, trunk assemblies, trunk lids, tailgates, roof panels, and reinforcement parts. The Class Period is from 1-1-2003 to date of Preliminary Approval Order. | **11-15-2015** | **For more information write to:****Ben Barnow****Barnow and Associates,**  **P.C.****One North LaSalle Street****Suite 4600****Chicago, IL 60602** |
| **8-10-2015** | **11-CV-08861** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Wallace v. IntraLinks, Inc., et al.**Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that IntraLinks made material misstatements and omissions relating to three aspects of its business. First, plaintiffs claim that IntraLinks failed to disclose that its largest customer, the Federal DepositInsurance Corporation (“FDIC”), told IntraLinks it would not renew its contract. Second, plaintiffs allege that IntraLinks misclassified business as Enterprise, which was more appropriately classified as DCM or M&A. Finally, the complaint alleges that IntraLinks failed to disclose that it was utilizing antiquated accounting practices which resulted in overcharging customers by 20-30%. The Class Period is from 2-17-2011 to 11-11-2011. | **11-12-2015** | **For more information write or call:****COHEN MILSTEIN** **SELLERS & TOLL PLLC****Carol V. Gilden****190 South LaSalle Street, Suite 1705****Chicago, IL 60603****312 357-0370 (Ph.)****Kenneth Rehns****88 Pine Street****14 Fourteenth Floor****New York, N.Y. 10005****212 838-7797 (Ph.)** |
| **8-11-2015** | **10-MD-02196** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **In re: Polyurethane Foam Antitrust Litigation****Gomez v. Hickory Springs Mfg., Co., et al.****Hudson, et al. v. Hickory Spring Mfg., Co., et al.****Beastrom, et al. v. Carpenter Co., et al.****Vicky’s Furniture v. Hickory Springs Mfg., Co., et al.**The Court’s 7-31-2015 Order (MDL 2196 Dkt. No. 1861) granting preliminary approval of the Settlement (as amended) and scheduling the Fairness Hearing. For more information see above CAFA Notice dated 8-5-2015. | **12-15-2015** | **For more information visit or call:**[**www.polyfoamclassaction.com**](http://www.polyfoamclassaction.com)**866 302-7323 (Ph.)** |
| **8-11-2015** | **14-CV-2926** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Justin Vitetta and Daniel Miller v. Sirius XM Radio Inc.**Intern-plaintiffs allege that Sirius XM violated the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”) and the New York Labor Law by failing to pay interns minimum wages. In 2015, the action was amended to add similar claims under the District of Columbia wage and hour laws. The Class Period for the New York is from Spring 2008 to the Spring of 2015 and for the District of Columbia Spring of 2011 to Spring 2015. | **1-5-2016** | **For more information write, call or visit:****Virginia & Ambinder, LLP****40 Broad Street****7th Floor****New York, NY 10004****212 943-9080 (Ph.)**[**www.vandallp.com**](http://www.vandallp.com) |
| **8-12-2015** | **12-CV-07948** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: OSG Securities Litigation**Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that there were untrue and misleading statements made in the Registration Statement OSG filed in connection with its sale of $300 million of Senior Notes to the public on 3-24-2010, and false and misleading statements made during the Class Period by Defendants Arntzen and Itkin. These alleged statements included specific representations concerning, among other things, the Company’s income taxes; accounting policies; controls and procedures; internal controls over financial reporting; tax benefits purportedly received by the Company; guidance on future tax benefits; how financial statements were prepared in conformity with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles; and guidance on future results. The Class Period is from 10-29-2007 to 10-19-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN** **& DOWD LLP****Ellen Gusikoff Stewart****655 West Broadway****Suite 1900****San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **8-14-2015** | **14-CV-00885** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **In re: Neustar, Inc. Securities Litigation**Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements and omissions, and engaged in a scheme to deceive the market. This artificially inflated the price of NewStar common stock and operated as a fraud or deceit on the Class. Later, when Defendants’ prior misrepresentations and fraudulent conduct were disclosed to the market on 1-29-2014 and 6-6-2014 (the “Class Period”), the price of NewStar common stock fell precipitously, as the prior artificial inflation came out of the price over time. As a result of their purchases of NewStar common stock during the Class Period, Plaintiff and other members of the Class allegedly suffered economic loss, i.e., damages, recoverable under the federal securities laws. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Bernstein Litowitz Berger** **& Grossmann LLP****Avi Josefson****1285 Avenue of the Americas****New York, NY 10019****212 554-1400 (Ph.)****212 554-1444 (Fax)** |
| **8-17-2015** | **14-CV-0453** | **(E.D. Mo.)** | **Steven Johnson, et al. v. AT&T Services, Inc., and Southwestern Bell Telephone Company**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that AT&T Services, Inc., and Southwestern Bell Telephone Company (“Defendants”) violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act (“FCRA”). Specifically, he alleges that Defendants’ standard FCRA disclosure form (the “Consumer Disclosure and Authorization Form”) did not comply with some of the requirements of the FCRA and that Defendants did not obtain proper authorization to procure consumer reports. The Class Period is from 3-11-2012 to the date of final approval of the settlement. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****C. Jason Brown****Jayson A. Watkins****Brown & Associates LLC****Attn: Johnson, No. 14-0453****301 S. U.S. 169 Hwy****Gower, MO 64454** |
| **8-17-2015** | **09-CV-00118** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Pasha S. Anwar, et al. v Fairfield Greenwich Limited, et al.**Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that the Citco Defendants comprised the administrator and custodian of the following Funds and the Funds’ assets: Fairfield Sentry Limited, Fairfield Sigma Limited, Fairfield Lambda Limited, Greenwich Sentry, L.P. and Greenwich Sentry Partners, L.P. (collectively, the “Funds”). Plaintiffs alleged in their Second Consolidated Amended Complaint (“SCAC”) filed with the Court on 9-29-2009, that the Citco Defendants made misrepresentations to investors in connection with sales of interests in the Funds and in acting as administrators and custodians for the Funds and breached fiduciary duties and contracts relating to investments in the Funds. The Class is described as all persons who were Beneficial Owners of shares or limited partnership interests in the Funds as of December 10, 2008 (whether as holders of record or traceable to a shareholder or limited partner account of record), and who suffered a Net Loss of principal invested in the Funds. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.FairfieldGreenwichLitigation.com**](http://www.FairfieldGreenwichLitigation.com)**.** |
| **8-17-2015** | **13-CV-1002****13-CV-2402** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation, Radiators and Automatic Transmission Fluid Warmers Dealership Actions (“Radiators”)****(ATF Warmers)**Automobile-dealership-plaintiffs allege that Defendants in each lawsuit conspired to fix, maintain, and artificially raise the price of component parts, i.e., Instrument Panel Clusters, Automotive Wire Harness Systems, Occupant Safety Restraint Systems, Instrument Panel Clusters, Fuel Senders, Switches, SAS, HID Ballasts, Starters, Alternators, Air Flow Meters, Valve Timing Control Devices, Fuel Injection Systems, Electronic Throttle Bodies, Ignition Coils, Inverters, Motor Generators, Radiators, or ATF Warmers. The lawsuits claim that, as a result of the relevant Defendants’ conduct, Dealers paid more than they should have for the parts at issue in that lawsuit and paid more for the vehicles in which those parts are contained. The lawsuits also allege that Dealers were unable to pass on all of these increased costs to their customers. These cases are proceeding as class actions for monetary recovery for Dealers in the District of Columbia and one or more of the following states: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin (the “Included States”). The lawsuits also seek nationwide injunctive relief. The Class Period is from 1-1-2000 to the execution Date of this Agreement.  | **11-18-2015** | **For more information visit:**[**www.AutoDealerSettlement.com**](http://www.AutoDealerSettlement.com) |
| **8-17-2015** | **13-CV-1003****13-CV-2403** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation, Radiators and Automatic Transmission Fluid Warmers End Payer Action**End-payer-plaintiff alleges that Defendants in each lawsuit agreed to unlawfully raise the price of certain motor vehicle component parts. As a result, businesses and consumers who purchased or leased qualifying new motor vehicles containing those parts, or who indirectly purchased replacement parts from the Defendants, may have paid more than they should have. The Class includes persons who: (1) bought or leased a qualifying new motor vehicle in the U.S. (not for resale), or (2) paid to replace one or more of the qualifying new motor vehicle parts. The Class Period is from 2000 to 2015.  | **5-4-2016** | **For more information visit:**[**www.AutoPartsClass.com**](http://www.AutoPartsClass.com) |
| **8-17-2015** | **14-CV-20589** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **David New, et al., v. Lululemon USA, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that the point of sale equipment (the “POS Device”) Defendant used in the Lululemon Stores are inaccessible to blind patrons of the store because the POS Devices are not tactile enabled. As a consequence, blind patrons cannot independently use the POS Devices. Plaintiffs contend that Defendant’s use of the POS Devices discriminates against blind patrons. The Class Period is from 1-1-2010 to 1-14-2015. | **12-15-2015** | **For more information visit:**[**www.accessnowsettlement.com**](http://www.accessnowsettlement.com) |
| **8-17-2015** | **14-CV-80929** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Best, et al. v. Bluegreen Corporation, et al.**Timeshare-owner-plaintiffs allege that Bluegreen sent letters to timeshare owners advising them that they were 90 days past due on their timeshare loan payments. Plaintiffs allege that the 90 Day Letter violated several provisions of the Florida Consumer Collection Practices Act (“FCCPA”). In particular, Plaintiffs allege that the 90 Day Letter is misleading because it states “[y]our termination for non-payment may result in a foreclosure being listed on your credit history with the credit bureaus.” Plaintiffs both received the 90 Day Letter. Plaintiffs also brought claims against Bluegreen for the reporting of the status of delinquent timeshare owner accounts to the credit reporting agencies using the code that signifies “foreclosed” and/or a “foreclosure,” which Plaintiffs claim was inaccurate. Plaintiffs’ accounts were both reported using the foreclosure code to at least one of the credit reporting agencies. The Class Period is from 7-15-2012 to 11-4-2013.  | **11-6-2015** | **For more information write or call:**Settlement Administrator A.B. Data, Ltd.600 A B Data Drive Glendale, WI 53217414 961-6400 (Ph.) |
| **8-20-2015** | **12-CV-7717** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Dr. David Beach and Christopher Kelly v. Citigroup Alternative Investments LLC**Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Citigroup made false and misleading representations and material omissions about the fund to investors in periodic performance reports. The representations and materials omissions were made in reports required to be provided to investors, and concerned the Fund’s commitment to invest in debt issued by a German company called ProSiebenSat.1 Media AG (“ProSieben”) which violated restrictions on investments represented to investors. The single ProSiebens position also exceeded the entire net asset value (“NAV”) of the fund at the time, thus requiring financing that exceeded borrowing limits of the funds. The Class is described as all who purchased, held or otherwise acquired (directly or indirectly) any class of shares in CSO Ltd. or CSO US Ltd. | **12-17-2015** | **For more information write, vist or call:****Jacob H. Zamansky, Esq.****ZAMANSKY LLC****50 Broadway, 32nd Floor****New York, NY 10004**[www.csohedgefundsettlement.com](http://www.csohedgefundsettlement.com)**212 742-1414 (Ph.)** |
| **8-24-2015** | **12-MD-2311****12-CV-00102** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Wire Harness Cases**Automotive Dealer-plaintiffs allege that Defendants, through certain of its employees, participated in a conspiracy with other persons and entities engaged in the manufacture and sale of automotive wire harnesses and related products, the primary purposes of which was to rig bids for, and to fix, stabilize, and maintain the prices of, automotive wire harnesses and related products sold to an automobile manufacturer in the United States and elsewhere. In furtherance of the conspiracy, agreements were allegedly reached to (a) allocate the supply of automotive wire harnesses and related products sold to an automobile manufacturer on a model-by-model basis, (b) rig bids quoted to an automobile manufacturer of automotive wire harnesses and related products, and (c) fix, stabilize, and maintain the prices, including coordinating price adjustments requested by an automobile manufacturer, of automotive wire harnesses and related products sold to an automobile manufacturer in the U.S. and elsewhere. The Class Period is from 1-1-2000 to 9-30-2011. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Cuneo Gilbert &**  **Laduca, LLP****507 C Street, NE****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, MN 55101** |
| **8-25-2015** | **11-CV-4665** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **City of Brockton Retirement Systems v. Avon Products, Inc., Andrea Jung, and Charles W. Cramb**Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that, during the Class Period, Defendants misrepresented that Avon’s level of success in international markets, most notably China and Latin America, was the result of legitimate activities that complied with both the letter and spirit of the anti-bribery provisions set forth in the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 (the “FCPA”). Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants knew about or recklessly disregarded ongoing bribery in certain markets, and that they made false and misleading disclosures about the Company’s internal controls and the steps they had taken to ensure investors of the integrity of Avon’s financial reporting. Plaintiffs alleged that, when the bribery and truth regarding Avon’s internal controls came to light, the price of Avon common stock declined and Plaintiffs and the Class were damaged. The Class Period is from 7-31-2006 to 10-26-2011. | **12-1-2015** | **For more information write to:**Gregg S. LevinWilliam S. NortonMOTLEY RICE LLC28 Bridgeside BoulevardMount Pleasant, South Carolina 29464William H. NarwoldMOTLEY RICE LLCOne Corporate Center20 Church Street, 17th FloorHartford, CT 06103 |
| **8-26-2015** | **10-CV-04429** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **NECA-IBEW Health & Welfare Fund v. Goldman Sachs & Co.**Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that the offering documents for the securities contained false and misleading statements about the underlying borrowers and collateral, thereby concealing the true nature, risk and overall quality of the securities. The Initial Complaint asserted claims under Sections 11, 12 and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 (the “Securities Act”) for material misrepresentations and omissions in GS Mortgage Securities Corp.’s 1-31-2007 Pre-Effective Amendment No. 1 to Form S-3 Registration Statement (Registration No. 333-139817) and its accompanying Prospectus Supplements (“Offering Documents”) that were filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission between 2007 and 2008. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLPArthur C. Leahy, Esq.Lucas F. Olts, Esq.655 W. BroadwaySuite 1900San Diego, CA 92101 |
| **8-27-2015** | **13-CV-05006** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Jeffrey Lapan, Ashwin Chandra, Claudia Bleus, v. PVH Corporation,**Employee-plaintiffs allege that Defendants’ Money Network Payroll Distribution Service unlawfully caused them to be charged fees for access to their wages. Plaintiffs also allege a nationwide breach of contract claim and a nationwide Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”) claim, 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq. The common law breach of contract and FLSA causes of action were brought on behalf of a nationwide putative class, and the remaining causes of action were brought on behalf of a California subclass. The Class Period is from 7-17-2014 to Date of Preliminary Approval. | **1-21-2016** | **For more information call:****Class Administrator****1 888 952-9081 (Ph.)** |
| **8-27-2015** | **12-MD-2311** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Wire Harness Cases**End Payor-plaintiffs allege that Defendants conspired to fix, maintain, and artificially raise the price of certain automobile component parts. The lawsuits claim that, as a result of Defendants’ conduct, Automobile Dealers paid more than they should have for these automobile parts and paid more for the new vehicles in which these parts were contained. The lawsuits also allege that Automobile Dealers were unable to pass on all of these increased costs to their customers. The Class Periods for all related parts can be found by visiting [www.autodealersettlement.com](http://www.autodealersettlement.com). | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.autodealersettlement.com**](http://www.autodealersettlement.com) |
| **8-27-2015** | **12-CV-04061** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Bruce v. Suntech Power Holdings Co., Ltd., et al.**Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that the price of Suntech Securities was artificially inflated as a result of a series of untrue or materially misleading statements regarding a loan guarantee. Lead Plaintiffs further contend that Defendant made these statements knowing them to be false or misleading, or recklessly disregarding their false or misleading natures, and that investors suffered injury as a result of the alleged inflation. The Class Period is from 8-18-2010 to 7-30-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, e-mail or call:****Daniel S. Sommers****Cohen Milstein Sellers and** **Toll PLLC****1100 New York Ave., N.W.****Suite 500****Washington, DC 20005****dsommers@cohenmilstein.com****202 408-4600 (Ph.)** |
| **8-28-2015** | **12-MD-02328** | **(E.D. La.)** | **In re: Pool Products Distribution Market Antitrust Litigation**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege a conspiracy among Pool Corporation, SCP Distributors LLC, and Superior Pool Products LLC (collectively, “PoolCorp”) and three of PoolCorp’s leading suppliers: Pentair, Zodiac Pool Systems, Inc. (“Zodiac”), and Hayward Industries, Inc. (“Hayward”) (collectively with PoolCorp, “Defendants”). Plaintiffs assert claimsagainst Defendants under Section 1 of the Sherman Act for conspiracy to restrain trade; and against PoolCorp under Section 2 of the Sherman Act for attempted monopolization. Plaintiffs are customers of PoolCorp and seek damages measured by the overcharges that they and other Class Members allegedly paid to PoolCorp above the prices that would have prevailed absent Defendants’ alleged illegal conduct, trebled, plus attorneys’ fees and costs, as provided by Section 4 of the Clayton Act. The Class Period is from 11-22-2007 to 11-21-2011.  | **1-8-2016** | **For more information call or visit:****1 844 322-8225 (Ph.)**[**www.poolproductsantitrustlitigation.com**](http://www.poolproductsantitrustlitigation.com) |
| **8-31-2015** | **14-CV-00656** | **(W.D.N.C.)** | **Carla Matthews, et al. v. Cloud 10 Corp.**Employee-plaintiffs allege that Defendant violated the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.*, and various state laws by failing to pay them time and a half for certain overtime hours worked performing the pre-shift, post-shift, and pre- and post-meal break preparatory activities of booting up computers and logging into computer systems, along with mid-shift connectivity issues. The Class Period is from 11-19-2011 to 8-17-2014. | **Between****11-2-2015** **and****11-13-2015** | **For more information write or call:****Jason Thompson****Kevin Stoops****Jesse Young, Esq.****Sommers Schwartz, P.C.****One Towne Square****Suite 1700****Southfield, MI 48076****248 355-0300 (Ph.)** |
| **8-31-2015** | **13-CV-09174** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Mark Roberti, et al. v. OSISystems, Inc., et al.**Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs assert claims against Defendants under Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 of the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) thereunder, and against the Individual Defendants under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. The Complaint alleged that between 1-24-2012 and 12-6-2013, inclusive, Defendants made materially false and misleading statements about OSI and Rapiscan, and Rapiscan’s contracts with the U.S. Government related to body scanner software and checkpoint baggage scanners. The Complaint further alleged that the prices of OSI securities were artificially inflated as a result of Defendants’ allegedly false and misleading statements, and declined when the truth was revealed. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Bernstein Litowitz** **Berger & Grossmann LLP****Timothy A. DeLange****Niki L. Mendoza****12481 High Bluff Drive****Suite 300****San Diego, CA 92130** |
| **8-31-2015** | **13-CV-01989** | **(E.D. Cal.)** | **Vicki Estrada, et al. v. iYogi, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that iYogi, or a third party acting on iYogi’s behalf, placed telemarketing calls (including but not limited to subscription renewal calls) to current and former iYogi subscribers. The lawsuit alleges that those calls were made without the necessary consent in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227. The Class Period is from 9-23-2009 to 11-18-2013. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Rafey S.Balabanian****Benjamin H. Richman****Edelson PC****350 North LaSalle Street****Suite 1300****Chicago, Illinois 60654** |