

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
7-3-2012	MDL-No.2047	(E.D. La.)	<p>In re: Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Products Liability Litigation Second Supplemental CAFA Notice; see Notice dated 6-15-12.</p>	11-13-2012	<p>For more information write, call or e-mail</p> <p>Arnold Levin Levin, Fishbein, Sedran & Berman 510 Walnut Street, Suite 500 Philadelphia, Pa 19106</p> <p>(215) 592-1500</p> <p>Alevin@lfsblaw.com</p>
7-6-2012	8-CV-11064	(D. Mass.)	<p>In re: Evergreen Ultra Short Opportunities Fund Securities Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the federal securities laws in registering, marketing and selling the fund as a stable "ultra short" bond fund that provided "current income consistent with preservation of capital and low principal fluctuation." Plaintiffs further allege that, contrary to these representations, the Fund was not an ultra short bond fund, nor one that preserved capital and maintained low principal fluctuation.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased shares of the Fund between 10-28-2005 and 6-18-2008, inclusive.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information call or visit:</p> <p>1-800-789-5631</p> <p>www.evergreenultrashortlitigation.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

7-6-2012	09-MN-02054	(D.S.C.)	<p>In re: Land America 1031 Exchange Services, Inc. (LES) Internal Revenue Service § 1031 Tax Deferred Exchange Litigation</p> <p>Plaintiffs filed Second Amended Consolidated Complaint arising out of the failure of LES to complete Internal Revenue Code Section 1031 exchange transactions. It is also alleged that the parent company, LandAmerica Financial Group, Inc. ("LFG") was negligent, engaged in fraud, constructive fraud and/or fraudulent concealment which proximately resulted in losses to certain LES commingled exchangers.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who entered into one or more 1031 exchange contracts with LES after 2-11-2008, and whose funds for 1031 exchange transactions were commingled, in whole or in part, with funds or other 1031 customers of LES, and were denied access to funds, or who did not receive timely access pursuant to the commingled exchanger's 1031 exchange contract.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit:</p> <p>www.attorneysc.com</p>
7-6-2012	07-CV-1635	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>Sven Mossberg, et al. v. IndyMac Bancorp, Inc and Michael W. Perry</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants issued materially false and misleading statements concerning, inter alia, IndyMac's growth and stability, resulting from the quality and success of the company's strong internal/operational controls and underwriting. It is further alleged that as a result of this conduct, the price of IndyMac common stock was artificially inflated, causing damage to lead plaintiffs and the other members of the class who purchased or otherwise acquired IndyMac common stock during the Class Period 3-1-2006</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit:</p> <p>www.IndyMacClassActionSettlement.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

			<p>through 3-1-2007, inclusive.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired IndyMac common stock from 3-1-2006 through 3-1-2007, inclusive.</p>		
7-6-2012	07-CV-798	(W.D. Okla.)	<p>Bill Fankhouser and Time Goddard v. XTO Energy Inc., f/k/a Cross Timbers Oil Company Plaintiffs allege that Defendant was in breach of contract, breach of oil and gas leases, breach of fiduciary duty, breach of implied duty to market and claims unjust enrichment, punitive damages and alleged underpayment of royalties due the royalty owners on the Class wells.</p> <p>Class Members are all royalty owners who were due royalty payments for gas purchased and produced by XTO from one or more of the Class wells.</p>	10-10-12	<p>For more information visit: www.xtoclassaction.com</p>
7-9-2012	11-CV-2012	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>Richard Wade Architects, P.C. et al. v. Engineering Services and Products Company (ESPC) Plaintiffs allege that Defendant sent unsolicited facsimile advertisement from ESPC and that the sending of this fax violated the Federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities with fax numbers, who in 12-2011, were sent faxes by ESPC, promoting its goods or services for sale, and who were not provided with an "opt out" notice.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit: www.edcombs.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

7-11-2012	08-CV-02516	(S.D.N.Y)	<p>In re: Municipal Derivatives Antitrust Litigation Second Supplement CAFA Notice; see Notice dated 6-7-2012.</p>	12-14-2012	<p>For more information visit, call or write: www.MunicipalDerivativesSettlement.com 1-877-310-0512 Municipal Derivatives Settlement c/o Rust Consulting, Inc. P.O. Box 2500 Faribault, NM 55021-9500</p>
7-12-2012	MDL-No.2047	(E.D. La.)	<p>Second Supplemental CAFA Notice regarding class action settlement by Arch Insurance Company In re: Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Products Liability Litigation The Court has modified the schedule for the Opt-Out/Objection Period and the date for the Formal Fairness Hearing, 11-13-2012 and 11-14-2012. The parties have filed with the Court an Amended Settlement Agreement regarding claims against Interior-Exterior in MDL-No.2047.</p>	11-13-2012 And 11-14-2012	<p>For more information write or call: D. Russell Holwadel Adams, Hoefer, Holwadel & Eldridge, L.L.C. 400 Poydras Street Suite 2450 New Orleans, La 70130 (504) 581-2606</p>
7-12-2012	08-CV-03812	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>Michael B. Coady and Robert Hakimian v. IndyMac Bancorp, Inc. et al. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants misled investors by issuing press releases and other statements that contained false and misleading information about the financial health of IndyMac Bancorp, Inc., which eventually filed for bankruptcy. The lawsuit claims that as a result of these alleged false and misleading statements, the value of IndyMac Bancorp, Inc. common stock was inflated and those investors</p>		<p>For more information write or call: Sherrie R. Savett Berger & Montague, P.C. 1622 Locust Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19103-6365 (800) 424-6690</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

			<p>who purchased IndyMac Bancorp, Inc. common stock at the inflated prices were damaged.</p> <p>Class Members are all purchasers or otherwise acquired IndyMac Bancorp, Inc. common stock between 3-1-2007 and 5-12-2008, through and inclusive (the "Settlement Class Period").</p>		
7-13-2012	10-CV-5336	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Hays, et al. v. Commonwealth Land Title Insurance Co., et al. Plaintiffs allege that LandAmerica Exchange Services, Inc. ("LES") failed to complete Internal Revenue Code Section 1031 exchange transactions. The lawsuit alleges that Defendants knowingly assisted LES in breaching certain duties owed to LES comingled exchangers.</p> <p>Class Members are each and every comingled exchanger who entrusted 1031 exchange funds to LandAmerica 1031 Exchanges Services, Inc. ("LES") after 2-11-2008 and was denied access to any of those exchange funds, and who allegedly suffered loss or damages in any way, directly or indirectly, related to or arising out of (a) the bankruptcy of LES, or (b) any of the events, acts or conduct alleged in the Complaint or the First Amended Complaint filed in the Hays Class Action.</p>	11-2-2012	<p>For more information visit, write to or call:</p> <p>www.hbsb.com</p> <p>Holister & Brace Robert L. Brace 1126 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101</p> <p>(805) 963-6711</p>
7-13-2012	11-CV-8577	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>Chang, et al. v. BD Stanhope, et al. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants: 1) required or permitted employees to share a portion of their tips with managers and non-service personnel; 2) improperly took a tip credit and failed to pay employees the proper minimum wage; and 3) retained gratuities paid by patrons who</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or e-mail</p> <p>Brian Schaffer, Esq. Fitapelli & Schaffer, LLP 475 Park Avenue South New York, NY 10016</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

			<p>hosted private events.</p> <p>Class Members are all servers, cocktail servers, bartenders, barbacks, and bussers who worked at Hiro Ballroom or Cabanas Lounge between 11-12-2004 and 3-31-2012.</p>		<p>(212) 300-0375</p> <p>bschaffer@fslawfirm.com</p>
7-13-2012	11-CV-01025	(W.D. Wash.)	<p>Raoul Meilleur v. AT&T Corp., et al. Plaintiffs allege that AT&T Corp. failed to comply with the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA") and the Washington Automatic Dialing and Announcing Devices Act ("WADAD") in its program to deliver pre-recorded messages (the "Calling Program").</p> <p>Class Members are all persons within the United States who between 7-30-2008 and 5-29-2012 received a telephone call pursuant to the Calling Program who had not selected AT&T Corp. as their subscribed long distance carrier at the time of the call, plus all California residents who received a call under the Calling Program and were named on the AT&T internal do-not-call list at the time they received the call.</p>	Not set yet	No information
7-13-2012	MDL-2047	(E.D. La.)	<p>In re: Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Products Liability Litigation Third Supplemental CAFA Notice; see Notice dated 6-15-12.</p>	11-13-2012	<p>For more information write, call or e-mail</p> <p>Arnold Levin Levin, Fishbein, Sedran & Berman 510 Walnut Street, Suite 500 Philadelphia, Pa 19106</p> <p>(215) 592-1500 Alevin@lfsblaw.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

7-17-2012	09-CV-7571	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>In re: R.H. Donnelley Corp. ERISA Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated ERISA by, among other things, permitting the Plan to hold shares of RHD Stock during the Class Period when they knew or should have known it was imprudent to do so.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who were participants in or beneficiaries of the Plan at any time between 7-26-2007 and 1-29-2010, inclusive (the "Class Period") and whose accounts included investments in R.H. Donnelley common stock in their accounts at any point during the Class Period.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit or call</p> <p>www.RHDonnelleyERISA settlement.com</p> <p>1-866-217-4461</p>
7-18-2012	10-CV-1658 10-CV-2765	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>Wendorf v. Landers, et al. O'Brien v. Landers, et al. Plaintiffs allege that charges imposed by Fitness Formula Clubs (FFCs) on its members were illegal. These charges included "monthly dues increases" imposed without a new contract, and "one time charges" imposed in lieu of a monthly dues increase without a new contract.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who are or were members of FFCs and had monthly dues increased, or received a one-time charge in lieu of an increase in dues, between 1-1-2005 and 12-31-2011.</p>	Not set yet	No information
7-18-2012	11-CV-770	(E.D. Va.)	<p>Dawn Lengrand v. WellPoint, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that WellPoint violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) because it failed to provide a copy of a consumer credit report used to make an employment decision</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Leonard A. Bennett Susan M. Rotkis Consumer Litigation</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

			<p>before taking adverse action and that it failed to provide a summary of rights as required by the FCRA.</p> <p>Class Members are all who applied for a job at WellPoint, which may have failed to provide a copy of the consumer report used to make an employment decision before taking adverse action based in whole or in part on the report.</p>		<p>Associates, P.C. 763 J. Clyde Morris Blvd. Suite 1A Newport News, Va. 23601</p>
7-18-2012	09-CV-0911	(W.D. Wash.)	<p>Cabbage v. The Talbots, Inc. and SmartReply, Inc.</p> <p>Plaintiffs alleged that Defendants had transmitted or caused to be transmitted pre-recorded telephone solicitations using an automatic dialing and announcing device ("ADAD") in violation of Telephone Consumer Protection Act during the four-year period preceding the filing of the complaint.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who received a pre-recorded telephone message in the State of Washington from an automatic dialing and announcing device which contained a promotional or commercial message concerning The Talbots, Inc., during the period 6-1-2005 through and including the Date of Settlement.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to, call or email:</p> <p>Williamson & Williams Rob Williamson Kim Williams 17253 Agate Street NE Bainbridge Island, WA 98110</p>
7-20-2012	07-CV-05944	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>In re: Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litigation (Panasonic Corporation (f/k/a Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.), Panasonic Corporation of North America, and MT Picture Display Co., Ltd. (collectively, "Panasonic").</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants and co-conspirators conspired to raise and fix the</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit:</p> <p>www.CRTDirectPurchaseAntitrustSettlement.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

			<p>prices of CRTs and 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.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities who, between 3-1-1995 and 11-25-2007, directly purchased a CRT Product in the United States from any defendant or any subsidiary or affiliate thereof ("Settlement Class").</p>		
7-20-2012	09-MD-02036	(S.D. Fla.)	<p>In re: Checking Account Overdraft Litigation Plaintiffs allege that the Bank of the West posted Debit Card Transactions in the order of highest-to-lowest dollar amount, which plaintiffs argue results in an increased number of Overdraft Fees assessed to customers.</p> <p>Class Members are all who had one or more Bank of the West consumer checking accounts accessible by Debit Card and, at any time between 6-1-2005 and 7-1-2011, incurred an Overdraft Fee as a result of Bank of the West's practice of posting Debit Card Transactions from highest to lowest dollar amount.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit:</p> <p>www.BankoftheWestOverdraftSettlement.com</p>
7-20-2012	07-MD-1827	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>In re: TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) LG Display America, Inc. and LG Display Co., LTD - Antitrust Litigation</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit:</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

			<p>Plaintiffs allege that defendants, the world's leading manufacturers of TFT-LCDs, conspired to artificially inflate prices by eliminating and suppressing competition, constraining supply, limiting capacity, and utilizing other practices designed to inflate and stabilize the prices of TFT-LCDs. The litigation affects a nationwide class and individual statewide classes of indirect purchasers of Thin-Film Transistor Liquid Crystal Displays ("TFT-LCD").</p> <p>National Class: the Nationwide Class is being brought to stop Defendants' illegal behavior and includes any person or business that indirectly purchased in the U.S., TFT-LCD panels incorporated in television, monitors and/or notebook computers, from one or more of the Defendants (listed in the response to Question 7) or Quata display Inc., between 1999 and the present, for their own use and not for resale, and reside in the U.S. as of the date of this notice.</p> <p>Statewide Damages Classes: Include any person or business that indirectly purchased TFT-LCD panels incorporated in TVs, monitors and/or notebook computers from one or more of the Defendants or Quanta Display Inc., from 1999 to 2006, for their own use and not for resale, while residing in the 24 states or DC. The purchase must have been made in the same state where the person or business resided.</p>		www.LCDclass.com
7-24-2012	08-CV-2431	(E.D. Pa.)	<p>In re: Wellbutrin XL Antitrust Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Valeant and co-defendants GlaxoSmithKline PLC and SmithKlineBeecham Corp. d/b/a GalaxoSmithKline (collectively, "GSK")</p>	Not set yet	No information

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

			<p>violated federal antitrust laws by engaging in an unlawful scheme to delay or block the market entry of less expensive, generic versions of Wellbutrin XL. Plaintiffs also allege that defendants conducted a four-part scheme to delay the entry of generic equivalents of Wellbutrin XL by: (1) filing sham patent litigations against certain generic manufacturers, (2) making improper listings in the FDA's "Orange Book," (3) filing a baseless FDA citizen petition and suit against the FDA, and (4) forming illegal agreements with potential generic competitors regarding the 150mg dosage of generic versions of Wellbutrin XL. Plaintiffs further allege they and the other members of the class were injured as a result of the defendants' illegal acts by paying more for Wellbutrin XL than they would have paid otherwise and/or from being unable to purchase less expensive, generic versions of Wellbutrin XL.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities in the United States and its territories that purchased Wellbutrin XL directly from any of the defendants at any time during the period of 11-14-2005 through 8-31-2009 (the "class period").</p>		
7-25-2012	10-CV-04191	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>Veera, et al. v. AMBAC Plan Administrative Committee, et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants were fiduciaries of the AMBAC Retirement Plan and that they breached fiduciary duties owed to the Plan's participants by continuing to permit investment in AMBAC common stock through the Plan and failing to take appropriate action when such investments allegedly became imprudent.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit or call:</p> <p>www.berdonclaims.com</p> <p>1-800-766-3330</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

			<p>Plaintiffs also allege liability for failure to monitor other fiduciary Defendants and co-fiduciary liability. Plaintiffs further allege that because Plan invested in AMBAC stock, plaintiff's retirement accounts lost value during the Class Period.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who were participants in or beneficiaries of the Plan and who held AMBAC common stock in their Plan accounts at any time between 10-1-2006 and 7-2-2008.</p>		
7-26-2012	07-MD-1827	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>In re: TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litigation Notice of Proposed Settlement from AU Optronics Corporation and AU Optronics (Indirect Purchase Plaintiffs); see Notice dated 7-20-2012</p>	11-12-2012	<p>For more information call or visit 1-855-225-1886 www.LCDclass.com</p>
7-26-2012	07-MD-1827	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>In re: TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litigation Notice of Proposed Settlement from Toshiba entities; see Notice dated 7-20-2012.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit or call: www.LCDclass.com 1-855-225-1886</p>
7-27-2012	07-MD-1827	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>In re: TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Notice of Proposed Settlement from AU Optronics Corporation America (Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs); see Notice dated 7-20-2012.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit: www.tftlcdclassaction.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in July, 2012 to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

7-27-2012	09-MD-2032	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>In re: Chase Bank U.S.A., N.A. "Check Loan" Contract Litigation</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that promotional loan offered by Chase to credit cardholders was subject to a fixed interest rate (APR) until the loan balance was paid off in full. In 11-2008 and 6-2009, Chase sent some of these cardholders a "Change in Terms" notice, raising their minimum monthly payment from 2% to 5% of their outstanding account balance and, in some cases, applying a \$10 monthly fee to their account. Plaintiffs brought this lawsuit alleging that the Change in Terms was improper.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities in the United States who entered into a loan agreement with Chase, whereby Chase promised a fixed APR until the loan balance was paid in full, and (i) whose minimum monthly payment was increased by Chase to 5% of the outstanding balance, or (ii) who were notified by Chase of a minimum payment increase and subsequently closed their account or agreed to an alternative change in terms offered by Chase.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit:</p> <p>www.chaseminpaymentlawsuit.com</p>
-----------	------------	-------------	--	-------------	--