|  **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name**  **Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **Website Link** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **12-2-2014** | **13-CV-01620** | **(D. Or.)** | **Thanane, et al. v. Providence Health & Services** Employee-plaintiffs allege that Providence used a Kronos (or “Provtime”) timekeeping system that rounded employees’ start and stop times. The complaint further alleges that, as a result of the timekeeping system and policies in place at Providence, Providence did not fully compensate employees for the time they actually worked because incidents of rounding adverse to the employees exceeded incidents of rounding favorable to the employees. It is further alleged that management employees at Providence altered employees’ time punches to reduce the employees’ recorded hours worked. Finally, the Plaintiffs allege that Providence deducted meal breaks from employee work hours without regard to whether an employee actually received a meal break. The Class Period is from 9-13-2007 to 9-13-2013. | **Not set yet** | Prepared by Brenda Berkley**For more information write to:****Thomas K. Doyle** **Bennett, Hartman, Morris** **& Kaplan, LLP****210 SW Morrison Street****Suite 500****Portland, OR 97204** |
| **12-3-2014** | **14-CV-00734** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Ann Fox v. Asset Acceptance, LLC**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that in its collection efforts, Defendant violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq. (“TCPA”), by calling consumers’ cellular telephones without “prior express consent,” using an “automatic telephone dialing system” and/or using an “artificial or prerecorded voice”. The Class Period is from 4-17-2009 to 9-4-2014.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information call:****Abbas Kazerounian Kazerouni Law Group,** **A.P.C.****800 400-6808** |
| **12-4-2014** | **08-MD-2002** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **In re: Processed Egg Products Antitrust Litigation**Direct-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that NuCal Foods, Inc., Hillandale Farms of Pa., Inc., and Hillandale-Gettysburg, L.P., (“Defendants”) conspired to limit the supply of shell eggs and egg products, which raised the price of shell eggs and egg products and, therefore, violated the Sherman Antitrust Act’s prohibition of agreements that unreasonably restrain competition. The Class Period is from 1-1-2000 to date of Preliminary Approval Order. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**http://www.eggproductssettlement.com**](http://www.eggproductssettlement.com) |
| **12-4-2014** | **13-CV-00896** | **(W.D. Mo.)** | **Katie Owusu, et al. v. MyTechHelp, LLC, et al.**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that MyTechHelp LLC (“MTH”) imposed recurring charges on consumers’ debit/bank cards without obtaining written authorization to do so, which violated the Electronic Funds Transfer Act (“EFTA”). The Class Period is from 9-13-2012 to 9-13-2013. | **3-24-2015** | **For more information write or email:****Thomas E. Schwartz****Justin Guerra****Holloran White Schwartz & Gaertner LLP****2000 So. 8th Street****St. Louis, Missouri 63105****tschwartz@holloranlaw.com****jguerra@holloranlaw.com** |
| **12-8-2014** | **13-CV-02998** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Aleta Lilly and David Cox, et al. v. Jamba Juice Company and Inventure Foods, Inc., f/k/a the Inventure Group, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that certain ingredients (the “Challenged Ingredients”) in certain Jamba Juice frozen smoothie kits (the “Challenged Products”) were falsely advertised as “all natural,” in violation of the Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq. (“UCL”), the California False Advertising Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, et seq. (“FAL”), and the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750, et seq. (“CLRA”), and Breach of Express Warranty, Cal. Com. Code § 2313. The Class Period is from 1-1-2010 to Present. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Finkelstein Thompson LLP****Rosemary M. Rivas****One California Street****Suite 900****San Francisco, CA 94111****415 398-8700 (Ph.)****415 398-8704 (Fax)****Glancy Binkow & Goldberg** **LLP****Marc L. Godino****1925 Century Part East****Suite 2100****Los Angeles, CA 90067****310 201-9150 (Ph.)****310 201-9160 (Fax)** |
| **12-10-2014** | **08-CV-4772** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: American International Group**Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated Sections 11, 12(a)(2), and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 (the “Securities Act”) and Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”). The Complaint alleges that Defendants violated federal securities law by misrepresenting and concealing the full extent of the Company’s exposure to the U.S. subprime residential real estate market, including in the Company’s credit default swap portfolio and its securities lending program. The Class Period is from 3-16-2006 to 9-16-2008. | **3-20-2015** | **For more information write to:****Barrack, Rodos & Bacine****Jeffrey W. Golan****Robert A. Hoffman****3300 Two Commerce Square****2001 Market Street****Philadelphia, PA 19103****The Miller Law Firm P.C.****E. Powell Miller****Marc L. Newman****950 West University Drive****Suite 300****Rochester, MI 48307** |
| **12-10-2014** | **12-CV-05062** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Gudimetla, et al. v. Ambow Education Holding Ltd., et al.**Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the federal securities laws by making false and misleading statements to the investing public as set out in the complaint, including that: (1) Ambow’s Registration Statement in connection with its Initial Public Offering (“IPO”) misrepresented the nature of its acquisition of the Changsha Study School; (2) Ambow inflated its software revenue by improperly recording accounts receivable; and (3) Ambow engaged in intentionally deceptive accounting practices concerning its allowance for doubtful accounts. The Class Period is from its initial public offering on 8-5-2010 through and including 2-27-2013, if Ambow American Depository Shares were held through at least 5-16-2012. | **3-16-2015** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Laurence M. Rosen****The Rosen Law Firm, P.A.****355 South Grand Avenue****Suite 2450****Los Angeles, CA 90071****213 785-2610 (Ph.)****213 226-4684 (Fax)** |
| **12-11-2014** | **11-MN-02000****11-CV-00983****12-CV-00088****12-CV-00087** | **(D.S.C.)** | **In re: Building Materials Corporation of America Asphalt Roofing Shingle Products Liability Litigation MDL 2283****Thompson v. GAF Materials Corporation****Green v. GAF Materials Corporation****First Baptist Church of Blairsville v. GAF Materials Corporation**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that the durability of certain Timberline® Shingles manufactured from 1-1-1999 through 12-31-2007 at a GAF plant in Mobile, Alabama and from 1-1-1998 through 12-31-2009 at all other GAF manufacturing plants might prematurely crack, split, or tear (cracking, splitting or tearing of shingles is all referred to in this Notice as “cracking” or “cracked”). Plaintiffs claim that the shingles were defective. The Class Period for Mobile Settlement Class is from 1-1-1999 to 12-31-2007 and for the Non-Mobile Settlement Class is from 1-1-1998 to 12-31-2009.  | **4-22-2015** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Shawn M. Raiter****Larson King, LLP****30 East 7th Street****Suite 2800****St. Paul, MN 55101****651 312-6518 (Ph.)****651 312-6615 (Fax)** |
| **12-11-2014** | **12-CV-00153** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Gail Hahn, et al. v. Massage Envy Franchising, LLC**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that the expiration of Unutilized Massages upon membership cancellation, nonrenewal, or termination for nonpayment constitutes an unlawful business practice and breaches the membership agreement. Unutilized Massages refer to monthly 50-minute member massages that members did not use prior to membership cancellation, termination for non-payment, or nonrenewal. The Plaintiffs seek changes in the membership agreement and seeks reinstatement of any Unutilized Massages that expired, among other things. The Class Period is from 12-7-2007 to the Date Court Grants Preliminary Approval. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Jeffrey Krinsk****Finkelstein & Krinsk LLP****501 West Broadway****Suite 1250****San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **12-11-2014** | **13-CV-21016** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Carlos Guarisma, et al. v. ADCAHB Medical Coverages, Inc., and Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Florida, Inc., d/b/a Florida Blue**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that ADCAHB Medical Coverages, Inc. (“ADCAHB”) made or initiated, or caused to be made or initiated, telemarketing calls marketing Florida Blue products or services in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227(b). The TCPA prohibits using an automatic telephone dialing system and/or an artificial prerecorded voice to make calls to cell phones without the prior express consent of the recipients, and restricts calling phone numbers that are on the National Do Not Call Registry. Plaintiff alleges that Florida Blue is responsible (or vicariously liable) for these alleged calls. The Class Period is from 3-21-2009 through [date of Preliminary Approval.] |  | **For more information write to:****Alexander H. Burke****Burke Law Offices, LLC****155 N. Michigan Avenue****Suite 9020****Chicago, IL 60601** |
| **12-11-2014** | **11-MN-02000****13-CV-03424****12-CV-00789****11-CV-03085****12-CV-00082****11-CV-02926****11-CV002879****11-CV-02785****11-CV-02784****12-CV-00095** | **(D.S.C.)** | **In re: Building Materials Corporation of America Asphalt Roofing Shingle Products Liability Litigation****Ashley v. Building Materials Corporation of America d/b/a GAF Materials Corporation****Byrd v. Building Materials Corporation of America d/b/a/ GAF Materials Corporation****Erickson v. Building Materials Corporation of America d/b/a GAF Materials Corporation** **Griffin v. Building Materials Corporation of America d/b/a GAF Materials Corporation****Haner v. Buildingh Materials Corporation of America d/b/a GAF Materials Corporation** **McDaniel v. Building Materials Corporation of America d/b/a GAF Materials Corporation****Morocco v. Building Materials Corporation of America d/b/a GAF Materials Corporation****Posey v. Building Materials Corporation of America d/b/a GAF Materials Corporation****Ragan v. Building Materials Corporation of America d/b/a GAF Materials Corporation**For more information please see CAFA Notice dated 10-3-2014***.*** On 12-2-2014, the Court preliminarily approved an Amended Settlement Agreement to reflect a minor change in the claims process.  | **4-22-2015** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Daniel A. Speights****A.G. Solomons, III****Speights & Runyon****P.O. Box 685** **200 Jackson Avenue East****Hampton, SC 29924****803 943-4444 (Ph.)****gsolomons@speightsrunyan.com****dspeights@speightsrunyan.com****Thomas H. Pope, III****Pope and Hudgens, P.A.****P.O. Box 190****1508 College Street****Newberry, SC 29108****803 276-2532 (Ph.)****thpope@popeandhudgens.com** |
| **12-12-2014** | **10-CV-00752** | **(W.D. Mich.)** | **Holder, et al. v. Enbridge Energy, Limited Partnership**Property-owner-plaintiffs allege that on or about 7-26-2010, Enbridge caused more than 840,000 gallons of crude oil to flow into the Talmadge Creek and Kalamazoo River, contaminating the air, waterways and wetlands, creating a noxious and toxic stench and killing or injuring wildlife. In response, Plaintiffs filed a class action lawsuit against Enbridge. Specifically, Plaintiffs claim that Enbridge released hundreds of thousands of gallons of oil resulting in the interference with Plaintiffs’ quiet use and enjoyment of their properties. The Settlement Class consists of the owners and occupants on 7-26-2010, of all tax parcels, including without limitation, residential properties, agricultural properties, vacant properties, and businesses, within 1,000 feet on either side of the Kalamazoo River, beginning where Talmadge Creek enters into the Kalamazoo River and ending at the mouth of Morrow Lake in Kalamazoo County. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Elizabeth Thompson****Hertz Schram****1760 South Telegraph Road****Suite 300****Bloomfield Hills, MI** **48302****248 335-5000 (Ph.)****David Fink****Fink + Associates Law****100 West Long Lake Road****Suite 111****Bloomfield Hills, MI** **48304****248 971-2500 (Ph.)** |
| **12-12-2014** | **14-CV-314** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Cooper v. Nelnet, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Nelnet violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq., (“TCPA”) by using an automatic telephone dialing system or artificial or prerecorded voice to place phone calls and SMS (text) messages to Plaintiff’s cellular telephone in an attempt to collect the debt of another individual, without Plaintiff’s prior express consent. The Class Period is from 2-21-2010 to the date of the Preliminary Approval of Settlement and Notice Order. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Scott D. Owens****664 E. Hallandale Beach** **Blvd.****Hallandale, FL 33009****954 589-0588 (Ph.)****scott@scottdowens.com** |
| **12-15-2014** | **13-CV-05197** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **I1 Fornaio (America) Corporation, et al. v Lazzari Fuel Company, Inc., et al.**Indirect-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendants fixed the prices of mesquite lump charcoal in violation of federal antitrust laws. Mesquite lump charcoal is a hardwood charcoal made from the mesquite tree, often used by restaurants and food-service distributors. The Class Period is from 1-1-2000 to 9-30-2011. | **4-22-2015** | **For more information write to:****Elizabeth C. Pritzker****Pritzker Levine LLP****180 Grand Avenue****Suite 1390****Oakland, CA 94612** |
| **12-15-2014** | **11-CV-02022** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Brandon Banks, et al. v. Nissan North America, Inc.**Purchaser-owner-plaintiffs allege that Nissan North America (“NNA”) failed to inform consumers that the Delta Stroke Sensor (“DDS”), a component in the brake booster in certain model year 2004-2008 Nissan Titan (with VDC), Nissan Armada, and Infiniti QX56 vehicles, could malfunction, causing an alleged reduction (but not a complete loss) of braking power. Plaintiffs allege that Continental Automotive Systems, Inc., formerly known as Continental Teves (“Continental”), manufactured the active brake booster containing the Delta Stroke Sensor at issue in this action. The Plaintiffs claim that NNA’s alleged failure to disclose this information constitutes fraud and violates the various state consumer protection laws. The Settlement Class includes all individuals in the U.S. who (1) currently own any model year 2004-2008 Nissan Titan (equipped with VDC), Nissan Armada, or Infiniti QX56 vehicles, or (2) do not presently own one of these vehicles, but previously did, and incurred the expense of repairing or replacing the Active Brake Booster and/or VDC control unit due to an issue with the Delta Stroke Sensor in the vehicle during the period of their ownership. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Ram, Olson, Gereghino & Kopcyznski LLP****Michael F. Ram****555 Montgomery Street****Suite 820****San Francisco, CA 94111****415 433-4949 (Ph.)****415 433-7311 (Fax)** |
| **12-15-2014** | **13-CV-86** | **(W.D. Mo.)** | **Ian Pollard v. Remington Arms Company, LLC and Sporting Goods Properties, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that the trigger mechanisms with a component part known as a trigger connector are defectively designed and can result in accidental discharges without the trigger being pulled. The lawsuit further claims that from 5-1-2006 to 4-9-2014 (the “Class Period”), the X-Mark Pro trigger mechanism assembly process created the potential for the application of excess bonding agent, which could cause Model 700 or Seven rifles containing such trigger mechanisms to discharge without a trigger pull under certain limited conditions. The lawsuit contends that the value and utility of these firearms have been diminished as a result of these alleged defects. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Jon D. Robinson****Bolen Robinson & Ellis,** **LLP****202 South Franklin****2nd Floor****Decatur, IL 62523****Richard J. Arsenault****Neblett, Beard &** **Arsenault****2220 Bonaventure Court** **Alexandria, LA 71301** |
| **12-19-2014** | **10-CV-711** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Sharon Cobb, et al. v. BSH Home Appliances Corporation**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that the Bosch or Siemans 27” front-loading Washers have a tendency to develop mold, bacteria, and/or other biofilm (a thin layer of bacteria or fungus that sticks to the inside surfaces of the washing machine), which can cause unpleasant odors. The lawsuit claims the washing machines: (a) do not effectively clean themselves or clothes, or work as advertised; (b) cause Washers or washed clothes to carry unpleasant odors; and (c) develop mold, mildew, bacteria, and/or other biofilm, which can lead to unpleasant odors. It also claims consumers paid more than they would have for the washing machines because BSH did not tell them, prior to purchase, about the machines’ tendency to develop mold, bacteria, other biofilms, and unpleasant odors, or about the upkeep required to reduce these issues. More specifically, the lawsuit alleged that BSH acted negligently, deceptively and improperly in designing, manufacturing, marketing, selling, and servicing Bosch and Siemens brand 27” front-loading automatic washing machines. It also alleges that (1) the Washers had an undisclosed tendency to develop bacteria, mold and foul odors (“BMFO”); (2) undisclosed tasks were required to reduce or improve BMFO and (3) BSH violated state consumer protection statutes, engaged in common law fraudulent concealment/nondisclosure, breached the express and implied warranties for the Washers, and was unjustly enriched (“Nationwide Claims”). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Eppsteiner & Fiorica** **Attorneys, LLP****Stuart M. Eppsteiner****12555 High Bluff Drive****Suite 155****San Diego, CA 92130** |
| **12-19-2014** | **14-CV-0087** |  | **Cooke, et al. v. Equal Energy Ltd., et al.** Shareholder-plaintiffs allege that Equal and its Board of Director breached fiduciary duties to the shareholders of Equal in connection with the acquisition of Equal Energy Ltd. by Petroflow Canada Acquisition Corp. The lawsuit further alleges that Petroflow and its parent corporation Petroflow Energy Corporation aided and abetted breaches of fiduciary duties and that all Defendants violated the Alberta Business Corporation Act and Securities Exchange Act. The Class Period is from 12-9-2013 to 7-31-2014. | **3-3-2015** | **For more information write to:****Ellen Gusikoff Stewart****Robbins Geller Rudman &** **Dowd LLP****655 West Broadway****Suite 1900****San Diego, CA 92101****James E. Howard****Dorsey & Whitney LLP****701 5th Avenue** **Suite 6100****Seattle, WA 98104-7043** |
| **12-22-2014** | **14-CV-895** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Elliot Reed v. Tennis Pro Shop, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Golf & Tennis Pro Shop, Inc. (“GTPS”) willfully violated the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act (“FACTA”), specifically 15 U.S.C. § 1681c(g)(1), which prohibits providing electronically printed receipts at the point of sale of transaction that display the expiration date of a person’s credit or debit card. Plaintiff claims that GTPS ignored the requirements of FACTA. The Class Period is from 2-12-2012 to 2-12-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Jeffrey W. Herrmann****Cohn Lifland Pearlman** **Herrmann & Knopf LLP****Park 80 West-Plaza One****250 Pehle Avenue****Suite 401****Saddle Brook, NJ 07663** |
| **12-23-2014** | **11-CV-00545** | **(D. Nev.)** | **Pancoe, et al. v. JBI, Inc., et al.**Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that, during the Class Period, JBI’s stock price was artificially inflated as a result of a series of untrue or materially misleading statements concerning JBI’s improper valuation of media credits acquired by the company in connection with its acquisition of JavaCo, Inc. Plaintiffs further contend that the Defendants 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 8-28-2009 to 1-4-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or email:****Lionel Z. Glancy****Glancy Binkow & Goldberg** **LLP****1925 Century Park East****Suite 2100****Los Angeles, CA 90067****1 888 773-9224****settlements@glancylaw.com** |
| **12-23-2014** | **10-CV-99325** | **(D. Del.)** | **Deborah Dungee v. Davison Design & Development, Inc.**Investor-plaintiff alleges that Davison made failed promises of invention services, misrepresentations concerning the chances of realizing a financial gain as a result of Davison’s invention services, and misrepresentations that Davison had a vast network of corporations with whom it had ongoing relationships and regularly negotiated licensing agreements successfully. The Class Period is from 1-28-2000 to 3-19-2006. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Richard H. Cross, Jr.****Christopher P. Simon****Cross & Simon, LLC****913 North Market Street****11th Floor****Wilmington, DE 19899-1380** |
| **12-26-2014** | **13-CV-01968** | **(D. Minn.)** | **Peter Roeser v. Best Buy Co., Inc., Best Buy Stores, L.P., BBY Solutions, Inc., Bestbuy.com, LLC, and Geek Squad**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Geek Squad improperly calculated the duration of “Ongoing Support” service from the date of purchase, rather than from the date of the customer’s home network installation, and that for certain customers who did not schedule a home network installation within six months of their purchase, Defendants deprived them of home network installation and any Home Networking Made Simple product services altogether. Class Members are all individuals who purchased Geek Squad's "Home Networking Made Simple" product from Geek Squad or Best Buy since 7-22-2012, and all individuals who, on 7- 22-2012, had "Home Networking Made Simple" contracts that had not yet expired or come up for renewal.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Robert J. Stein III****Alvarado Smith, APC****1 MacArthur Place****Suite 200****Santa Ana, CA 92707****714 852-6837 (Ph.)****714 852-6899 (Fax)****Steven P. Blonder****Much Shelist, P.C.****191 North Wacker Drive****Suite 1800****Chicago, IL 60606****312 521-2402 (Ph.)****312 521-2100 (Fax)** |
| **12-26-2014** | **13-CV-7750** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Milman, et al. v. Thermos L.L.C.**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Defendant misled consumers into purchasing the Foogo® stainless steel vacuum-insulated straw bottles or Foogo® plastic straw bottles by advertising the bottles as “leak-proof” (the “Lawsuit”). Plaintiffs asserted the Bottles have a tendency to leak. The Class Period is from 1-1-2007 through and including the Preliminary Approval Date. | **5-27-2015** | **For more information write to:****Janine Pollack****Wolf Haldenstein Adler** **Freeman & Herz LLP****270 Madison Avenue****New York, NY 10016** |
| **12-29-2014** | **11-CV-8066** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Oklahoma Police Pension and Retirement System v. U.S. Bank National Association**Plaintiff-noteholder alleges (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 Trusts, 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 contract that governed the Covered Trusts (called Indentures) and for alleged violations of the federal Trade Indenture Act of 1939. The “Settlement Class” is defined as all former and current holders of Notes issued by the Covered Trusts.  | **Not set yet** | **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** |
| **12-29-2014** | **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 the Preliminary Approval Date. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Timothy G. Blood****Blood Hurst &**  **O’Reardon, LLP****701 B Street****Suite 1700****San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **12-29-2014** | **13-CV-01915** | **(W.D. Wash.)** | **Haley v. TalentWise, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that TalentWise violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act by preparing background checks on people that contain non-conviction records that predate the report by more than seven years or contain multiple listings of driving-related criminal charges that stem from the same incident. The Class Period is from 10-24-2011 to the Preliminary Approval Date. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Nichols Kaster, PLLP****Attn: E. Michelle Drake****4600 IDS Center****80 South 8th Street****Minneapolis, MN 55402** |