| **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1-3-2017** | **14-CV-05237** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Ruiqi Ye, Yolin Han v. Sephora USA**  The Action was filed against Sephora alleging it discriminatorily deactivated from its website thousands of customers in the U.S. whose customer accounts had email addresses with China-based service providers: @qq.com, @126.com and @163.com. The Action alleges that Sephora prevented these users from participating in the annual 20% discount sale available to VIB and VIB Rouge customers scheduled to begin on 11-6- 2014 (the “VIB Sale”). | **Not set yet**  Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more information write, call or e-mail:**  **Jeanne M. Christensen Elizabeth J. Chen**  **WIGDOR LLP**  **85 Fifth Avenue**  **New York, NY 10003**  **212 257-6800 (Ph.)**  [**jchristensen@wigdorlaw.com**](mailto:jchristensen@wigdorlaw.com)  [**echen@wigdorlaw.com**](mailto:echen@wigdorlaw.com) |
| **1-3-2017** | **13-CV-60066** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Inetianbor v. CashCall, Inc. and John Paul Reddam**  Plaintiffs claim that CashCall, a California corporation, was the real lender for the Western Sky loans. Plaintiffs added class action claims in an existing lawsuit that was filed by Abraham  Inetianbor against CashCall in the United States District Court for the Southern District of  Florida claiming on behalf of all similarly situated borrowers that CashCall violated the Florida usury statute, Fla. Stat. § 687.02, *et seq.*; the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act, Fla. Stat. §§ 501.201-.213; that Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaratory judgment; and that Mr. Reddam has direct personal liability for CashCall’s conduct. | **5-15-2017** | **For more information write or e-mail:**  **Janet Varnell**  **Varnell & Warwick, P.A.**  **P.O. Box 1870**  **Lady Lake, FL 32158**  [**jvarnell@varnellandwarwick.com**](mailto:jvarnell@varnellandwarwick.com) |
| **1-3-2017** | **16-CV-02508** | **(D.D.C.)** | **Ross, et al. v. Lockheed Martin Corp.**  Plaintiffs allege that Lockheed Martin discriminated against African American salaried employees below the level of Vice President throughout the United States on the basis of their race in several aspects of their employment. Mediator Linda Singer, of the private mediation group JAMS, held close to a dozen in-person mediation sessions, as well as numerous telephonic sessions, during which Class Counsel and the Plaintiffs advocated for meaningful monetary relief for the Class, forward-looking changes to Company policies and independent oversight over the Settlement. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Mehri & Skalet, PPLC**  **1250 Connecticut Ave., NW**  **Suite 300**  **Washington, DC 20036**  **202 822-5100 (Ph.)**  **202 822-4997 (Fax)** |
| **1-3-2017** | **13-CV-01902** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotve Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **(In re: Electronic Powered Steering Assemblies, All Dealership Actions)**  **Re Defendants: Yamada Manufacturing Co./, Ltd. and Yamada North America, Inc. (collectively “Yamada”)**  Plaintiffs allege that the Defendant, through its managers and employees, participated in a conspiracy with other manufacturers of steering columns to suppress and eliminate competition in the automotive parts industry by agreeing to rig bids for, and to fix, stabilize, and maintain the prices of one model's steering columns sold to a certain subsidiary of Honda in the United States. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Don Barrett**  **David McMullan**  **BARRETT LAW GROUP, P.A.**  **P.O. Box 927**  **404 Court Square**  **Lexington, MS 39095**  **662 834-2488 (Ph.)** |
| **1-6-2017** | **14-CV-02411** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Kumar v. Salvo North America Corp.**  The lawsuit alleges that Salvo North America Corporation improperly marketed products as “Imported From Italy.” The lawsuit alleges that – as disclosed on the back label – most of the olive oil in the products sold originated from olives grown in other countries, and then shipped to Italy for blending and bottling before being exported to the United States. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Adam Gutride**  **Seth Safier**  **Kristen Simplicio**  **Gutride Safier LLP**  **100 Pine Street**  **Suite 1250**  **San Francisco, CA 94111**  **415 639-9090 (Ph.)**  **415 449-6469 (Fax)** |
| **1-6-2017** | **14-CV-596** | **(S.D. Ill.)** | **Dr. Robert L. Meinders, D.C., Ltd. v. the Emery Wilson Corporation d/b/a/ Sterling Management Systems**  Plaintiff alleges that Sterling Management Systems violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act and various state laws by sending unsolicited advertisements by fax. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Phillip A. Bock**  **134 N. LaSalle Street**  **Suite 1000**  **Chicago, IL 60602** |
| **1-6-2017** | **10-CV-0252**  **14-CV-2067** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Petrie v. Electronic Game Card Inc., et al.**  **Pace v. Quintanilla, et al.**  The lawsuit alleges that the Defendants violated the federal securities laws by issuing false and misleading financial statements, engaging in a fraud to conceal and misstate Electronic Game Card’s true financial condition; and issuing materially misleading “clean” or unqualified audit and interim reports for Electronic Game Card’s financial statements. | **1-9-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **Laurence M. Rosen**  **THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.**  **355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2450**  **Los Angeles, CA 90071** |
| **1-6-2017** | **12-MD-02311**  **13-CV-02202**  **13-CV-02203** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **Automatable Dealership and**  **End-Payor Action**  **Re Defendants: Aisan Industry Co., Ltd., Franklin Precision Industry, Inc., Aisan Corporation of America, Hyundam Industrial Co., Ltd., (collectively “Aisan”)**  Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a  result of Aisan Defendants’ participation in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain,  and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for fuel injection systems in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act and various state antitrust, unfair competition, unjust enrichment, and consumer protection laws as set forth in Automobile Dealership Plaintiffs’ Consolidated Class Action Complaint in the  Fuel Injection Systems Action. | **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** |
| **1-6-2017** | **10-MD-2185** | **(S.D. Tex.)** | **In re: BP p.l.c. Securities Litigation**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants are in violation of Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and SEC Rule 10b-5 thereunder on behalf of a proposed class of all persons or entities that purchased or otherwise acquired BP ADSs or ordinary shares between 2-16-2007 and 5-28-2010. The New York and Ohio Complaint included allegations that BP and other defendants made misrepresentations in two broad categories: (i) misrepresentations regarding certain safety practices prior to the 4-20-2010 Deepwater Horizon disaster (“Pre-Explosion Claims”); and (ii) misrepresentations regarding the amount of oil being spilled into the Gulf of Mexico in late April and early May 2010 (“Post-Explosion Claims”). | **2-13-2017** | **For more information write or call:**  **Berman Devalerio**  **Glen DeValerio**  **Steven J. Buttacavoli**  **One Liberty Square**  **Boston, MA 02109**  **617 542-8300 (Ph.)**  **Block & Leviton LLP**  **Jeffrey C. Block**  **Jason M. Leviton**  **Erica Langsen**  **155 Federal Street**  **Suite 400**  **Boston, MA 02110**  **617 398-5600 (Ph.)** |
| **1-6-2017** | **15-CV-07548** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **John M. Flynn v. Sientra, Inc., et al.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants misrepresented and/or omitted material facts concerning Silimed’s manufacturing plant’s compliance with Good Manufacturing Practices such that silicate and cotton fibers and other substances were contaminating the finished product; that  Defendants knew of, or recklessly disregarded, these allegedly noncompliant conditions; that investigations undertaken both by third parties and Silimed itself confirmed the above contamination and allegedly non-compliant conditions; and that such manufacturing problems and contaminations were serious, ultimately compelling the September 2015 suspension of the CE Mark for Silimed’s products by European regulators. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:**  **GLANCY PRONGAY & MURRAY**  **LLP**  **Lionel Z. Glancy**  **Robert V. Prongay**  **1925 Century Park East Suite 2100**  **Los Angeles, CA 90067**  **310) 201-9150 (Ph.)**  [**lglancy@glancylaw.com**](mailto:lglancy@glancylaw.com) |
| **1-6-2017** | **16-CV-07102** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Ma, et al. v. Harmless Harvest, Inc.**  This lawsuit claims that certain representations made in the advertising for and packaging of certain products with “labels stating” “100% Organic” or “Raw” were not accurate and were false or misleading. Plaintiffs claim that they and other purchasers paid more for Harmless  Harvest’s coconut water products than they would have absent such advertisements and packaging. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **C.K. Lee**  **Lee Litigation Group,**  **PLLC**  **30 East 39th Street**  **Second Floor**  **New York, NY 10016**  **212 465-1180 (Ph.)** |
| **1-6-2017** | **15-CV-04106** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Philip J. Carvat, et al. v. Plymouth Rock Energy, LLC, et. al.**  Plaintiffs allege that, on or after 7-13-2011, Plymouth Rock violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 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 representatives allege that Plymouth Rock did not have the recipients’ permission to make these calls. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Jennifer Murray, Terrell Marshall Law Group PLLC**  **936 North 34th Street Suite 300**  **Seattle, WA 98103** |
| **1-7-2017** | **15-CV-04524** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Thomas Lagos v. The Leland Stanford Junior University**  Plaintiff alleges that certain policies and practices followed by Defendants in procuring or causing to be procured background checks on employees and job applicants without providing a “stand alone” disclosure informing them that a background check would be procured. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **The Dion-Kindem Law Firm**  **Peter R. Dion-Kindem**  **21550 Oxnard Street**  **Suite 900**  **Woodland Hills, CA 91367** |
| **1-9-2017** | **13-CV-06368** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Slaughter, et al. v. Wells Fargo Advisors**  Plaintiffs allege that Wells Fargo maintained policies that had an unlawful disparate impact against African American Financial Advisors and Financial Advisor trainees, and that Wells Fargo engaged in a pattern or practice of racial discrimination against African American Financial Advisors and Financial Advisor Trainees with respect to, among other things, Wells Fargo’s company-wide team organization, account distribution, territory, and banking support assignment policies and practices. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Linda D. Friedman**  **Suzanne E. Bish**  **George S. Robot**  **STOWELL & FRIEDMAN, LTD.**  **303 W. Madison**  **26th floor**  **Chicago, Illinois 60606**  **312 431-0888 (Ph.)** |
| **1-10-2017** | **12-CV-00101**  **12-CV-00401** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **In re: Wire Harness**  **In re: Heater Control Panels**  **Re Defendants: Sumitomo Electric Industries, Ltd., Sumitomo Wiring Systems, Ltd., Sumitomo Electric Wiring Systems, Inc. (incorporating IK&S Wiring systems, Inc.) and Sumitomo Wiring Systems (U.S.A.) Inc. (collectively, “Sumitomo”)**  See CAFA Notices dated 9-8-2016 and 9-23-2016 for more information. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:**  **David H.Fink**  **Darryl Bressack**  **Fink + Associates Law**  **100 WestLong Lake Road**  **Suite 111**  **Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304**  [**dfink@finkandassociateslaw.com**](mailto:dfink@finkandassociateslaw.com)  [**dbressack@finkandassociateslaw.com**](mailto:dbressack@finkandassociateslaw.com) |
| **1-10-2017** | **16-CV-572** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **McBride and Bartlow v. Medical Facilities of America, Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that they applied for jobs at skilled nursing homes managed by Medical Facilities of America, Inc. (“MFA”). Each facility obtained a criminal background check from Apex Background Checks, Inc. Plaintiffs were denied employment based on the results of their background check. Plaintiffs also allege that they did not receive a copy of their respective criminal background checks, along with a disclosure of their rights under the Fair Credit Reporting Act, at least five business days before the adverse employment decisions. | **3-27-2017** | **For more information**  **Leonard A. Bennett**  **Consumer Litigation**  **Associates, P.C.**  **763 J. Clyde Morris Blvd. 1A**  **Newport News, VA 23601** |
| **1-12-2017** | **14-CV-00490** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Donald Maddy, et al. v. General Electric Company**  The Lawsuit alleges that GE violated the federal Fair Labor Standards Act and various state laws by failing to pay service technicians for all hours worked. Specifically, the Lawsuit contends that GE failed to pay service technicians for: (1) pre-shift computer work (logging onto GE’s computer system, etc. and drive time to the first customer of the day); (2) working through lunch; (3) post-shift computer work; and (4) other unpaid work - receiving, unpacking and organizing parts and servicing of the GE supplied van. | **5-17-2017** | **For more information write, call or visit:**  **Justin L. Swidler**  **Richarfd S. Swartz**  **Swartz Swidler, LLC**  **1101 King Hwy N.**  **Suite 402**  **Cherry Hill, NJ 08034**  **877 529-9501 (Ph.)**  [**www.swartz-legal.com**](http://www.swartz-legal.com) |
| **1-13-2017** | **11-CV-2164** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Van Hove, et al. v. Universal Travel Group, Inc., et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that Universal Travel Group, Inc. (“UTG”) Defendants violated the federal securities laws during the Class Period by overstating UTG’s 2008 and 2009 revenues, falsely claiming that UTG owned its subsidiaries, and falsely claiming that UTG sold poorly performing business assets at a profit, and misused cash raised in public offerings. Lead Plaintiffs allege that the Settling Auditor Defendants falsely stated that ACSB’s audit of UTG’s financial statements comported with standards enacted by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board. | **6-6-2017** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **The Rosen Law Firm, P.A.**  **Jonathan Horne**  **275 Madison Avenue**  **34th Floor**  **New York, NY 10016**  **212 686-1060 (Ph.)**  **212 202-3827 (Fax)** |
| **1-13-2017** | **16-CV-01215** | **(W.D. Tex.)** | **Abramson v. CWS Apartment Homes, LLC**  Plaintiff alleges that CWS Apartment violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act by allegedly initiating unsolicited telemarketing calls. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Edward A. Broderick**  **Anthony I. Paronich**  **Broderick & Paronich, P.C.**  **99 High Street, Suite 304**  **Boston, MA 02110** |
| **1-13-2017** | **14-CV-01049** | **(W.D. Tex.)** | **Schilling, et al. v. Mid-America Apartment Community, Inc., et al.**  **Re Defendant: Mid-America Apartment, L.P.**  The Plaintiffs claim the Defendants (apartment owners and landlords) violated the Texas Water Code and Public Utility Commission Rules that prohibit apartment owners/landlords from collecting water connection fee and waste water utility service fees for apartments that were located in Austin, Dallas/Fort Worth, Houston, and San Antonio metropolitan areas. | **4-26-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **Britton D. Monts**  **THE MONTS FIRM**  **401 Congress Avenue**  **Suite 1540**  **Austin, Texas 78701** |
| **1-17-2019** | **15-CV-4082** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Rufino Cano, et al. v. Nineteen Twenty Four, Inc. d\b\a Roberta’s Pizzeria, et al.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and other non-management employees overtime wages for hours worked over forty (40) in a given workweek, in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), the New York Labor Law (NYLL), failed to pay spread-of-hours pay for days in which Plaintiff worked a spread of ten (10) or more hours, and failed to provide wage notices and wage statements, pursuant to the NYLL. | **3-30-2017** | **For more information write or call:**  **Pelton Graham LLC**  **111 Broadway, Suite 1503, New York, NY 10006**  **212 385-9700 (Ph.)** |
| **1-18-2017** | **13-CV-02811** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Sullivan, et al. v. Barclays PLC, et al**.  Plaintiffs allege that HSBC and other banks manipulated, aided and abetted the manipulation of, and conspired, colluded, or engaged in racketeering activities to manipulate the Euro Interbank Offer Rate (“Euribor”), and the prices of Euribor-based derivatives in violation of the Commodity Exchange Act, the Sherman Antitrust  Act, the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, and state common law. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **LOWEY DANNENBERG COHEN**  **& HART, P.C**  **Vincent Briganti**  **Geoffrey M. Horn**  **One North Broadway**  **White Plains, NY 10601**  **914 997-0500 (Ph.)**  **914 997-0035 (Fax)** |
| **1-19-2017** | **16-CV-02505**  **15-CV-02306** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **Cheryl Lenart v. Visionworks of America, Inc.**  Plaintiffs alleged that Visionworks made its BOGO offers continuously and repeatedly, such that, over time, the cost of the first pair of eyeglasses inflated above its regular price and covered part of the cost of the second pair of eyeglasses, which was supposed to have been free. Plaintiffs further alleged that Visionworks sometimes offered an *unadvertised* alternative to the BOGO offer, which its sales clerks were uniformly trained to offer if a customer balked at the high BOGO price. The alternative *single-pair* offer was purportedly a 40% discount from the regular price of a single pair of eyeglasses. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Drew Legando**  **Landskroner Grieco Merriman LLC**  **1360 West 9th Street**  **Suite 200**  **Cleveland, Ohio 44113**  **216 522-9000 (Ph.)** |
| **1-20-2017** | **14-CV-00786** | **(D. Minn.)** | **Beaver County Employees’ Retirement Fund; Erie County Employees’ Retirement Systems; and Luc De Wulf v. Tile Shop Holdings, Inc.; Robert A. Rucker; The Tile Shop, Inc.; Timothy C. Clayton; Peter J. Jacullo III; JWTS, Inc.; Peter H. Kamin; Todd Krasnow; Adam L. Suttin; William E. Watts; Robert W. Baird & Co. Incorporated; Citigroup Global Markets Inc.; CJS Securities, Inc.; Houlihan Lokey Capital Inc.; Piper Jaffray & Co.; Sidoti & Company, LLC; Telsey Advisory Group LLC; and Wedbush Securities, Inc.**  Lead Plaintiffs allege that, as a result of Defendants’ materially false statements and omissions, Tile Shop’s common stock traded at artificially inflated price levels during the Class Period and that, as the truth was revealed, Tile Shop’s stock price declined. In addition, Lead Plaintiffs alleged that the outside directors, as signatories of Tile Shop’s registration statements for two secondary public offerings during the Class Period, and the underwriters who conducted the offerings, should be held liable for the non-disclosures of the related-party transactions with Nishi and BP. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or visit:**  **Kessler Topaz Meltzer &**  **Check, LLP**  **Matthew Mustokoff**  **280 King of Prussia Road**  **Radnor, PA 19087**  **Robbins Geller Rudman &**  **Dowd LLP**  **Joseph Russello**  **58 South Service Road, Suite 200**  **Melville, NY 11747**  [**www.tileshopsecuritiessettlement.com**](http://www.tileshopsecuritiessettlement.com)**.** |
| **1-20-2017** | **16-CV-80060** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Brandon Leidel, and Michael Wilson, et al. v. Project Investors, Inc. d/b/a Cryptsy**  **Re Defendants: Paul Vernon, Lorie Ann Nettles, Ridgewood Investments, Inc., a New Jersey Corporation, and Kaushal Majmudar, (collectively, “Individuals)**  Plaintiffs allege that the Cryptsy Defendants operated an online business for general consumers and the public to exchange, invest, and trade in digital cryptocurrencies, including “Bitcoin” and “Litecoin.” Similar to a bank, but existing only in the “virtual” world, Cryptsy customers, including Plaintiffs and the Class, deposited their digital currency in accounts held at, and purportedly protected and managed by, Cryptsy. Plaintiffs alleged that the Cryptsy Defendants acted unlawfully by denying the Class the ability to withdraw or use the funds in their accounts and by stealing for the Cryptsy Defendants’ own use and benefit the digital currency held in the Cryptsy customer accounts. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Marc A. Wites**  **Wites & Kapetan, P.A.**  **4400 N. Federal Highway**  **Lighthouse Point, FL 33064** |
| **1-20-2017** | **16-CV-10471** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Crandall, et al. v. PTC Inc., et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants falsely asserted that PTC had voluntarily disclosed to the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) and the Department of Justice (“DOJ”) the results of an internal investigation into alleged bribery engaged in by PTC’s subsidiaries in China during the period between 2005 and 2010 in violation of the alleged Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (the “FCPA Violations”). The complaint further alleges that Defendants falsely reassured investors that PTC was cooperating with the SEC and DOJ’s subsequent investigation of the alleged FCPA violations. The complaint alleges that PTC withheld material information concerning the alleged FCPA violations, and was not eligible for voluntary disclosure credit. These misstatements, the complaint alleges, artificially inflated the price of PTC’s stock, which later fell following PTC’s announcement that it would be paying a penalty to the DOJ in addition to disgorgement of profits. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Laurence M. Rosen**  **The Rosen Law Firm,P.A.**  **275 Madison Avenue**  **34th Floor**  **New York, NY 10016**  **212 686-1060 (Ph.)**  **212 202-3827 (Fax)** |
| **1-20-2017** | **14-CV-02855** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Cohn v. New Century Financial Services, Inc., and Prewsier & Pressler, LLP**  This lawsuit claims that Pressler and New Century Financial Services, Inc., (“NCFSI”) violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (“FDCPA”) by sending consumers a collection letter, which stated the following: **“Amount Sought: $[amount] which includes filing and service costs of $[amount]”.** The lawsuit alleges that the foregoing statement violated FDCPA, by adding unauthorized, unwarranted, excessive, and unlawful charges to Plaintiff’s alleged debt. | **4-27-2017** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Jacob Scheiner**  **SCHEINER &SCHEINER**  **181 Club Drive,**  **Suite 5br**  **Woodmere, NY 11598**  **516 284-6282 (Ph.)**  **516 284-6282 (Fax)** |
| **1-24-2017** | **16-CV-00120** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **Campos-Carranza, et al. v. Credit Plus, Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that Credit Plus willfully violated the provision of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) when it included a MERS Report with information that indicated Plaintiffs had mortgage liens with an “inactive” status, without indicating whether the mortgage lien was paid-in-full, transferred to another servicer, foreclosed, or discharged in bankruptcy. Plaintiffs alleged that this practice of using “inactive” as a status is incomplete or misleading and can cause the mortgage underwriting process to be delayed or result in other problems with underwriting. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Kelly & Crandall, PLC**  **4084 University Drive**  **Suite 202A**  **Fairfax, VA 22030** |
| **1-25-2017** | **15-CV-00348** | **(N.D. Ga.)** | **Ahrens, et al. v. UCB Holding, Inc., et al.**  The Complaint alleges that under the terms of the buy-out plan, UCB was required to provide service credit for the years that employees worked at Northampton or Whitby prior to those companies’ being acquired by UCB. The Complaint also alleges claims about the disclosures that were made concerning pre-acquisition service credit, the procedures and disclosures related to UCB’s recalculation of pension benefits related to pre-acquisition service credit, the procedures related to the administrative process whereby Plaintiffs challenged the recalculation of their benefits related to pre-acquisition service credit, and attempted or actual recoupment of monies previously paid by the buy-out plan related to pre-acquisition service credit. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **BLOCK & LEVITON LLP**  **R. Joseph Barton**  **1735 20th Street.**  **Washington, D.C. 20009** |
| **1-25-2017** | **7-CV-5944** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Mitsubishi Electric Visual Solutions America, Inc., and Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc. (the “Mitsubishi Electric Defendants”)**  The lawsuit alleges that Defendants and Co-Conspirators conspired to raise and fix the prices of CRTs and the CRTs contained in certain finished products for over ten years, resulting in overcharges to direct purchasers of those CRTs and certain finished products containing CRTs. The complaint describes how the Defendants and Co-Conspirators allegedly violated the U.S. antitrust laws by establishing a global cartel that set artificially high prices for, and restricted the supply of CRTs and the televisions and monitors that contained them. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write:**  **Guido Saveri**  **R. Alexander Saveri**  **SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.**  **706 Sansome Street**  **San Francisco, CA 94111** |
| **1-25-2017** | **12-CV-00101** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **In re: In re: Wire Harness Cases**  **Re Defendants: Yazaki Corporation and Yazaki North America, Inc. (collectively, “Yazaki”)**  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. Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs further allege that as a result of the conspiracy, they and other direct purchasers of wire harness products were injured by paying more for those products than they would have paid in the absence of the alleged illegal conduct, and they seek recovery of treble damages, together with reimbursement of costs and an award of attorneys’ fees**.** | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **David H. Fink**  **Darryl Bressack**  **Nathan J. Fink**  **FINK + ASSOCIATES LAW**  **38500 Woodward Avenue Suite 350**  **Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304**  **248 971-2500 (Ph.)** |
| **1-25-2017** | **14-CV-10105** | **(D. Mass.)** | **KBC Asset Management, et al. v. Aegerion Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.**  ﻿Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by issuing false and misleading statements and/or failing to disclose that; (i) Defendants illegally marketed JUXTAPID beyond its FDA-approved label; (ii) the Company was experiencing a higher than expected drop-out rate for JUXTAPID clinical studies; (iii) more patients than expected were not filling their JUXTAPID prescriptions; and (iv) issues existed relating to the performance of, or the potential market for, JUXTAPID, including, but not limited to, statements and omissions of information necessary for investors to understand that  JUXTAPID was not performing and could not lawfully perform as well in the market as the  Defendants’ statements and omissions led the public to believe. Lead Plaintiffs further allege that the drop-out rate and patient-elected non-starts were key metrics that Aegerion utilized to forecast its annual revenue guidance. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Ellen Gusikoff Stewart**  **ROBBINS GELLER**  **RUDMAN & DOWD LLP**  **655 West Broadway**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **1-26-2017** | **16-CV-07648** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Stone, et al. v. LKQ Corporation, Inc.**  This lawsuit alleges that The Coast Distribution System, Inc., purchased by LKQ, sent fax advertisements in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq*. The Class Representative claims that LKQ sent the faxes without prior express permission and that the faxes did not contain required opt-out notices. | **5-2-2017** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Steven Woodrow**  **Class Counsel**  **Woodrow & Peluso, LLC**  **3900 East Mexico Ave.**  **Suite 300**  **Denver, CO 80210**  **720 213-0675 (Ph.)**  **303 927-0809 (Fax)** |
| **1-27-2017** | **15-CV-2017** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Wood v. J Choo USA, Inc., d/b/a Jimmy Choo**  Plaintiff claims Jimmy Choo violated the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act (“FACTA”) by willfully printing credit card and debit card transaction receipts at its stores in the United States that included card expiration dates between 10-27-2013 and 11-2-2015. | **4-25-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **Seth M. Lehrman**  **Farmer, Jaffe, Weissing,**  **Edwards, Fistos &**  **Lehrman, P.L.**  **425 N. Andrews Ave.**  **Suite 2**  **Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301** |
| **1-27-2017** | **12-CV-1117**  **14-CV-01694**  **15-CV-06122** | **(D.N.J.)** | **In re: PHH Lender Place Insurance Litigation**  **Patrick Gallo v. PHH Mortgage Corporation**  **Kevin Finch, et al. v. PHH Mortgage Corporation**  **Joseph Burroughs, et al. v. PHH Mortgage Corporation**  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 home equity line of credit, and evidence of acceptable coverage was not provided PHH would place insurance in a manner such that PHH allegedly received an unauthorized benefit. Plaintiffs allege further that PHH did so primarily to receive alleged “kickbacks” in the form of expense reimbursements or expense subsidies from the Assurant Defendants. Plaintiffs also allege that the way in which Lender Placed Insurance policies were obtained and placed caused the amounts charged to be excessive. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Peter A. Muhic**  **Kessler Topaz Meltzer &**  **Check, LLP**  **280 King of Prussia Road**  **Radnor, PA 19087**  **610 667-7706 (Ph.)**  **610 667-7056 (Fax)** |
| **1-30-2017** | **14-CV-00258** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **James Hayes, et al. v. Delbert Serbices Corp., CashCall, Inc. and John Paul Reddam**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated federal and Virginia law by making and collecting loans to Virginians with annual interests in excess of the 12% annual interest prescribed by Virginia law, and without meeting the criteria for an exception to this law. Plaintiffs alleged that Defendants violated that law, as well as other state and federal laws related to the servicing and collection of those loans. | **Not set yet** | **For more information e-mail or call:**  [**info@VirginiaCashCallSettlement.com**](mailto:info@VirginiaCashCallSettlement.com)  **1 855 470-8532 (Ph.)** |
| **1-30-2017** | **15-CV-04429** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Yapstone Data Breach**  Yapstone discovered that certain Personally Identifiable Information (“PII”) of its users may have been exposed through unsecured online unique resource locators (“URLs”), or web addresses, when users submitted applications to use its payment processing platform. PII including the name, address, date of birth, and bank account information—and in some cases, social security numbers, driver’s license numbers, and/or passport numbers, if provided by the applicant—may have been exposed between 7-15-2014 and 8-5-2015. In 9-2015, Yapstone sent an Incident Notice to potentially affected users to notify them of the Incident and offered two years of complimentary credit protection and fraud resolution. Plaintiffs claim that Yapstone maintained inadequate data security practices, delayed in notifying users of the Incident, violated various state statutes, breached implied contracts, and unfairly profited from users. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Tina Wolfson**  **Robert Ahdoot**  **Ahdoot & Wolfson, PC**  **1016 Palm Ave, West Hollywood, CA 90069** |
| **1-30-2017** | **14-CV-00081** | **(D. Md.)** | **Edward J. Fangman, et al. v. Genuine Title, LLC, et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that certain PNC employees participated in a scheme to refer borrowers to Genuine Title. The Plaintiffs also contend that PNC should be held responsible for the conduct of those employees who allegedly accepted kick-backs from Genuine Title in exchange for an agreement to refer borrowers to Genuine Title. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Michael Paul Smith**  **Smith, Gildea & Schmidt,**  **LLC**  **600 Washington Avenue**  **Suite 200**  **Towson, MD 21204** |
| **1-31-2017** | **MDL-2420** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litigation**  The lawsuit alleges that Defendants and co-conspirators conspired to raise and fix the prices of cylindrical Li-Ion Cells for over ten years, resulting in overcharges to indirect purchasers of portable computers, camcorders, and power tools containing Li-Ion Cylindrical Batteries. The complaint describes how the Defendants and co-conspirators allegedly violated the U.S. and state antitrust, unfair competition, and consumer protection laws by agreeing to fix prices and restrict output of these cells by, among other things, face-to-face meetings and other communications, customer allocation, and the use of trade associations. | **11-8-2016**  **Must call to check date** | **For more information visit or call:**  [**WWW.BATTERIESCONSUMERLITIGATION.COM**](http://WWW.BATTERIESCONSUMERLITIGATION.COM)  **1 855 730-8645 (Ph.)** |
| **1-31-2017** | **10-CV-4228** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Sharif Stinson, et al. v. The City of New York, et al.**  The City of New York (“City”) has agreed to pay $75 Million in money damages to approximately 1,000,000 people who were issued a summons without probable cause that were later dismissed for legal or facial insufficiency. | **5-24-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **Gerald M. Cohen**  **Joshua P. Fitch**  **Cohen & Fitch, LLP**  **233 Broadway, Suite 1800**  **New York, NY 10279** |
| **1-31-2017** | **15-CV-01069** | **(S.D. Ind.)** | **Ashack v. Caliber Home Loans, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that, on or after 7-9-2011, Caliber 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. The class representative claims that Caliber did not have the recipients’ permission to make these calls. | **5-31-2017** | **For more information write to:**  **Terrell Marshall Law Group**  **PLLC**  **936 North 34th Street**  **Suite 300**  **Seattle Washington 98103** |