| **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name****Summary of Issue**  | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3-2-2016** | **13-CV-4866****14-CV-00947** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Jaffe and Adler v Bank of America, N.A.****Whittenburg v. Bank of America, N.A.**Mortgagor-plaintiffs allege that Bank of America failed to timely present to the appropriate NewYork State recording officer certifications that Plaintiffs' residential mortgages serviced by Bank of America had been fully satisfied, which allegedly violated New York Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law § 1921 and New York Real Property Law § 275. The Actions furtherallege that this happened to thousands of other New York residential mortgages satisfied after7-12-2010. The Class Period is from 7-12-2010 to 11-27-2015.  | **Not set yet** | Prepared by Brenda Berkley**For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Finkelstein, Blankinship,** **Frei-Pearson &** **Garber, LLP****1311 Mamaroneck Avenue Suite 220****White Plains, N.Y. 10605****Tel: (914) 298-3281****Fax: (914) 824-1561****Attn:****D. Gregory Blankinship****gblankinship@fbfglaw.com** |
| **3-3-2016** | **12-CV-00102****12-CV-00103** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Sumitomo****Automobile Dealer (Plaintiffs)****End-Payor (Plaintiffs)**The lawsuits claim that the 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 new motor vehicles (not for resale) containing those parts or who indirectly purchased replacement parts (not for resale) from the Defendants may have paid more than they should have. The Class is described as all persons who at any time from 1998 to 2015: (1) bought or leased a new motor vehicle in the U.S. (not for resale), or (2) paid to replace one or more of the new motor vehicle parts (not for resale). New motor vehicles include, but are not limited to, automobiles, cars, light trucks, pickup trucks, crossovers, vans, mini-vans, and sport utility vehicles. |  **5-4-2016** | **For more information write, call or visit:****Steven Williams Cotchett,** **Pitre, & McCarthy LLP****San Francisco Airport** **Office Center****840 Malcolm Road****Suite 200****Burlingame, CA 94010****Hollis Salzman****Robins Kaplan LLP****601 Lexington Avenue****Suite 3400****New York, NY 10022****1 877 940-5043 (Ph.)**[**www.AutoPartsClass.com**](http://www.AutoPartsClass.com) |
| **3-4-2016** | **12-CV-5481** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Villa v. San Francisco Forty Niners, Ltd.****Re Defendants: National Football League, NFL Properties, Inc., the individual NFL clubs, and Reebok International Ltd.** Indirect-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that the Defendants violated the federal Sherman Act, California Cartwright Act and Unfair CompetitionLaw by entering into a series of agreements that limited competition among rival apparel manufacturers and increased prices for purchasers of products containing the logo, trademarks, emblems or other intellectual property of the NFL and its teams. The Class Period is from 10-25-2008 to 4-1-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Roy A. Katriel****The Katriel Law Firm****4225 Executive Square****Suite 600****LaJolla, CA 92037****858 242-5642 (Ph.)****858 430-3719 (Fax)** |
| **3-4-2016** | **09-CV-06309** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Niloofar Saeidian, et al. v. The Coca Cola Company**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that the labeling and advertising for Minute Maid Enhanced Pomegranate Blueberry Flavored Blend of 5 Juices (the “Juice”) was false and misleading because it misled purchasers to believe that the primary ingredients by volume in the Juice were pomegranate juice and blueberry juice. The Class Period is from 9-1-2007 to date of Preliminary Approval. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Jordan L. Lurie****Capstone Law APC****1840 Century Park East****Suite 450****Los Angeles, CA 90036****Steven A. Zalesin****Patterson Belknap Webb** **& Tyler LLP****1133 Avenue of the** **Americas****New York, NY 10036** |
| **3-4-2016** | **09-CV-02338** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **EK Vathana v. EverBank, et al.**Purchaser-plaintiff alleges that EverBank breached the terms and conditions of a contract governing CDs by using currency conversion rates that were “commercially unreasonable” and by converting them into U.S. dollars (the “Terms and Conditions Claim”), and that EverBank lacked contractual authority to close the CDs (the “Contractual Authority Claim”). The Class is described as “all purchasers of an EverBank WorldCurrency Certificate of Deposit denominated in Icelandic [Króna] which matured between 10-8-2008 and 12-31-2008.” | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Michael Millen****119 Calle Marguerita #100****Los Gatos, CA 95032****408 871-0777 (Ph.)** |
| **3-4-2016** | **08-CV-2516** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Municipal Derivatives Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: George K. Baum & Company (“GKB”), National Westminster Bank PLC (“NatWest”), Natixis Funding Corp., Piper Jaffray & Co., Societe Generale SA, and UBS AG (“UBS”)**Purchaser-plaintiff alleges that certain Provider Defendants, Provider Co-Conspirators, Broker Defendants, and Broker Co-Conspirators (collectively referred to herein as “Defendants”) conspired to fix, maintain or stabilize the price of, and to rig bids and allocate customers and markets for, municipal derivatives. The Class is defined, for purposes of this Settlement only, to include all state, local and municipal government entities, independent government agencies and private entities that (i) purchased by negotiation, competitive bidding or auction Municipal Derivative Transactions from Natixis or any Alleged Provider Defendant or Alleged Provider Co-Conspirator, or (ii) purchased by negotiation, competitive bidding or auction Municipal Derivative Transactions brokered by any Alleged Broker Defendant or Alleged Broker Co-Conspirator, at any time from 1-1-1992 to 8-18-2011, in the United States and its territories or for delivery in the United States or its territories. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****William C. Carmody****Seth D. Ard****SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.****560 Lexington Avenue****15th Floor****New York, NY 10022****212 336-8330 (Ph.)****212 336-8340 (Fax)****Michael D. Hausfeld****Megan E. Jones****HAUSFELD LLP****1700 K Street, NW****Suite 650****Washington, DC 20006****202 540-7200 (Ph.)****202 540-7201 (Fax)** |
| **3-4-2016** | **09-CV-00118** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Anwar, et al. v. Fairfield Greenwich Limited, et al.**Purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendants PricewaterhouseCoopers Accountants N.V. and PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (collectively “PwC) failed to exercise reasonable care and were negligent in the audits of the Funds’ financial statements for the periods ended 12-31-2002-2005 (for PwC Netherlands) and 12-31-2006-2007 (for PwC Canada). The Class is described as all Persons who were Beneficial Owners of shares or limited partnership interests in the Funds as of 12-10-2008 (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 write to:****Robert C. Finkel****Wolf Popper LLP****845 Third Avenue****New York, NY 10022** |
| **3-4-2016** | **13-CV-2152** | **(D. Or.)** | **Hetherington v. Omaha Steaks, Inc., et al.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Defendants OMAHA STEAKS, INC. ("Omaha Steaks") and OMAHA STEAKS INTERNATIONAL, INC. ("Omaha Steaks International") (collectively, "OS") violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (47 U.S.C. § 227) (TCPA), and other legal prohibitions under statutory and common law, with its marketing and advertising campaigns by placing thousands of phone calls over four years using automatic telephone dialing equipment to cellular phone subscribers without their prior express written consent. The Class Period is from 12-9-2009 to 12-17-2013. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.foodcallsettlement.com**](http://www.foodcallsettlement.com) |
| **3-8-2016** | **14-CV-04490****14-CV-6317** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Yaeger, et al. v. Subaru of America, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Subaru of America, Inc. and Fuji Heavy Industries, Ltd.**Lessee- and purchaser-plaintiffs allege that certain Subaru vehicles from model years 2011 to 2015 (the “Settlement Class Vehicles”) suffer from a design defect that causes them to consume excessive amounts of engine oil. It is further alleged that Defendants have violated certain consumer statutes and breached certain warranties. The Class is described as all residents of the continental United States who currently own or lease, or previously owned or leased, a Settlement Class Vehicle originally purchased or leased in the continental United States, including Alaska. | **7-26-2016** | **For more information call or visit:****855 384-8926 (Ph.)**[**www.oilconsumption.settlementclass.com**](http://www.oilconsumption.settlementclass.com) |
| **3-11-2016** | **14-CV-01542** | **(E.D. Mo.)** | **Reginald Moore, et al. v. Family Dollar Stores, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Family Dollar caused text messages to be sent to consumers from 10-16-2013 to 3-7-2016. The lawsuit claims that Family Dollar violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act because consumers did not provide prior express written consent to receive these text messages. | **6-22-2016** | **For more information visit:**[**www.FDTCPASettlement.com**](http://www.FDTCPASettlement.com) |
| **3-11-2016** | **12-CV-02078** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Muhammed Abdeljalil, et al. v. GE Capital Retail Bank (“Synchrony”)**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Synchrony used an automatic telephone dialing system and/or an artificial or prerecorded voice to place non-emergency phone calls to cell phones in connection with its customer accounts, and that these calls were made without the prior express consent of the persons called. The Class Period is from 8-22-2008 to date of Preliminary Approval Order.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Kazerouni Law Group, APC****Abbas Kazerounian****245 Fischer Avenue****Suite D1****Costa Mesa, CA 92626** |
| **3-14-2016** | **14-CV-00178** | **(W.D. Okla.)** | **Hart v. SandRidge Energy Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: SandRidge Operating Inc., and Lariat Services, Inc. (collectively “SandRidge”)**Employee-plaintiffs allege that SandRidge violated the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq., as well as state laws of Oklahoma, Kansas and Texas, by failing to properly pay drillers, derrickmen, floorhands and motormen (collectively, “Affected Positions”) for (1) time spent in pre-shift safety meetings, (2) time spent putting on and taking off personal protective equipment, and (3) for not including bonuses earned by employees in the Affected Positions in the calculation of their regular hourly rate, which resulted in underpayment for overtime hours worked. The Relevant Time Period is from 7-15-2009 to 9-30-2014. The specific back pay period applicable to each claim for which payment is allocated under this Agreement is as follows: FLSA safety meeting claim time period is 7-24-2011 to 6-10-2013; Rule 23 state law safety meeting claim time period is 7-15-2010 to 6-10-2013; the Texas safety meeting claim time period is 7-15-2009 to 7-15-2010; and the FLSA bonus claim time period is 7-24-2011 to 9-20-2014. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call or e-mail Class Counsel:****877 505-2667 (Ph.)****davidwarta@ssrok.com** |
| **3-14-2016** | **15-CV-00085** | **(D.N.D.)** | **Aleem, et al. v. Pearce & Durick, et al. and Wright, et al. v. Pearce & Durick (Consolidated)**Investor-plaintiffs allege that investments sold by North Dakota Developments, LLC ("NDD"), allegedly with Pearce & Durick’s assistance, were in the form of Land Lease and Management Agreements and membership units in four commercial housing developments for workers in the Bakken oil field region of western North Dakota and eastern Montana - so-called “man camps” intended to house workers. The four developments include Great American Lodge - Watford City West, Great American Lodge - Culbertson, Montana, Transhudson - Parshall, and Great American Lodge - Watford City East. Plaintiffs allege that these investments constituted unregistered securities under applicable law. The offering materials for the NDD offering allegedly contained misrepresentations and failed to disclose material facts necessary to make the statements made in the offering documents, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading, in violation of N.D.C.C. § 10-4-2004 and N.D.C.C. § 10-4-2010. Defendants allegedly provided legal services to members of the Class in connection with, inter alia, the review of documents provided to members of the Class in connection with their investments in NDD real estate developments, and allegedly committed legal malpractice in connection with such professional services. The Class Period is from 5-1-2012 to 6-30-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Alan Rosca****PEIFFER, ROSCA, WOLF, ABDULLAH, CARR & KANE** **A PROFESSIONAL LAW** **CORPORATION** **1422 Euclid Avenue****Suite 1610****Cleveland, Ohio 44115****216 570-0097 (Ph.)****888 411-0038 (Fax)****arosca@prwlegal.com****J. Barton Goplerud****Brian O. Marty****HUDSON, MALLANEY, SHINDLER &** **ANDERSON, P.C.****5015 Grand Ridge Drive, Suite 100****West Des Moines, Iowa 50265****515 223-4567 (Ph.)****515 223-8887 (Fax)****jbgoplerud@hudsonlaw.net** |
| **3-16-2016** | **14-CV-01956** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **In re: CytRx Corporation Securities Litigation**Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges that the price of CytRx securities was artificially inflated during the Class Period as a result of alleged false and misleading statements and omissions by the promotion firm, the DreamTeam Group. The proposed Settlement, if approved by the Court, will settle claims of all persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired the publicly-traded securities of CytRx between 11-20-2013 and 3-13-2014, inclusive (the “Class”). | **5-9-2016** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Kahn Swick & Foti, LLC****Lewis S. Kahn****206 Covington Street****Madisonville, LA 70447****504 455-1400 (Ph.)****504 455-1498 (Fax)** |
| **3-17-2016** | **15-CV-3509** | **(W.D. Pa.)** | **Sherry Brown, et al. v. Reita’s Water Ice Franchise Company LLC**Plaintiffs allege that Rita’s violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq., when Rita’s sent text messages to their cellular telephones without their prior express written consent using an automatic telephone dialing system. The texts were Rita’s “Cool Alerts” notifications of frozen confection products Rita’s had available for sale. Plaintiffs allege that Rita’s did not have proper prior express written consent to send the messages and in some instances continued to send them the “Cool Alerts” messages after receiving a request from the recipient to stop sending the texts. The Class Period is from 6-22-2011 to 9-15-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Lemberg Law, LLC****43 Danbury Road, Wilton, CT 06897****Woodrow & Peluso, LLC 3900 E. Mexico Avenue****# 300****Denver, CO 80210** **203 653-2250 (Ph.)** |
| **3-17-2016** | **13-CV-08376** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Rosalio Campos, et al. v. Calumet Transload Railroad, LLC, et al.****Re Defendants: DTE Chicago Fuels Terminal, LLC, George J. Beemsterboer, Inc., Beemsterboer Slag and Ballast Corporation, KCBX Terminals Company, and Koch Carbon, LLC. (Consolidated with Case Nos. 13-CV-08499 and 13-CV-09038).**Property-owner-plaintiffs allege that the Defendants failed to take reasonable and adequate measures to prevent petroleum coke(“petcoke”) and coal dust from contaminating nearby communities. They claim that petcoke and coal dust from the petcoke and coal stored at three Storage Facilities (located at 3259 East 100th Street, Chicago, Illinois; 10730 South Burley Avenue, Chicago, Illinois; and 2900 East 106th Street, Chicago, Illinois) blew onto and contaminated their properties. Petcoke is the product of oil refinery coker units or other cracking processes. It is a black-colored carbon-based solid that may contain sulfur as well as traces of metals and other non-volatile compounds. The Class Period is from 10-31-2008 to date of Preliminary Approval. | **7-26-2016** | **For more information write to:****Ben Barnow****Barnow and Associates,** **P.C.****One North LaSalle Street Suite 4600****Chicago, IL 60602** |
| **3-17-2016** | **11-CV-07866** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: MF Global Holdings Limited Securities Litigation (Deangelis v. Corzine)****Re Defendants: Jefferies LLC, BMO Capital Markets Corp., Natixis Securities Americas LLC, Lebenthal & Co., LLC, and U.S. Bancorp Investments, Inc. (collectively, the “Remaining Senior Notes Underwriter Defendants”)**Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the federal securities laws by, among other things, making false and misleading statements regarding MF Global or were statutorily liable for false and misleading statements in MF Global’s offering materials for certain MF Global securities. The Class is described as all persons who and entities which purchased or otherwise acquired 6.25% Senior Notes between 8-8-2011 and 11-21-2011 (the “Class Period”) (including persons who and entities which placed orders before 8-8-2011), and were damaged thereby.  | **7-15-2016** | **For more information visit or call:**[**www.MFGlobalSecuritiesClassAction.com**](http://www.MFGlobalSecuritiesClassAction.com)**877 940-5045 (Ph.)** |
| **3-18-2016** | **08-CV-2516** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Municipal Derivatives Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: George K. Baum & Company (“GKB”), National Westminster Bank PLC (“NatWest”), Natixis Funding Corp., Piper Jaffray & Co., Societe Generale SA, and UBS AG (“UBS”)**This notice supplements the original notice from Rust Consulting, setting a Final Fairness Hearing Date. For more information see CAFA Notice dated 3-4-2016. | **7-8-2016** | **For more information call or visit:****877 310-0512 (Ph.)**[**www.MunicipalDerivativesSettlement.com**](http://www.MunicipalDerivativesSettlement.com) |
| **3-18-2016** | **14-CV-05789** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **James Bull v. US Coachways, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that telemarketing calls made by US Coachways violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 (the “TCPA”). The class is described as all persons within the United States who received one or more text message advertisements on behalf of US Coachways, Inc. at any time in the four years prior to the filing of the Complaint continuing through the date of this Settlement Agreement. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Brian K. Murphy****Joseph F. Murray****Murray Murphy Moul +** **Basil LLP****114 Dublin Road****Columbus, OH 43204** |
| **3-18-2016** | **15-CV-29702** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **O’Brien v. GovSimplified, LLC**Plaintiff alleges that GovSimplified deceived its customers by: (1) making it seem that its websites were affiliated with the IRS; (2) making it seem that obtaining EINs from the IRS is a cumbersome process that would be expedited by Defendant; (3) representing that its tiered services were designed to obtain a higher price for speeding up the process of obtaining EINs from the IRS; and (4) failing to properly obtain a customer’s signature authorizing GovSimplified to obtain an EIN on that customer’s behalf. The Class Period is from 1-30-2011 to date of Preliminary Approval. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call fax or e-mail:****Andrew Benjamin Boese****Leon Cosgrove LLC****255 Alhambra Circle****Suite 800****Coral Gables, FL 33134****305 740-1975 (Ph.)****305 437-8158 (Fax)****aboese@leoncosgrove.com** |
| **3-21-2016** | **14-CV-1031** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **The Department of the Treasury of the State of New Jersey and its Division of Investment v. Cliffs Natural Resources, Inc.****Re Defendants: Cliffs Natural Resources Inc. (“Cliffs” or the “Company”), Joseph Carrabba, Laurie Brlas, David Blake, and Terry Paradie (collectively, “Individual Defendants,” and together with Cliffs, “Defendants”)**Investor-plaintiff is asserting claims against all Defendants under Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, and against the Individual Defendants under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. The Amended Complaint alleges, among other things, that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements and omitted material information regarding the impact of Cliffs’ acquisition of a controlling interest in Consolidated Thompson Iron Mines Limited, including the Bloom Lake iron ore mine located in Quebec, Canada. New Jersey alleges in the Amended Complaint that Defendants fraudulently misled investors into believing that the acquisition and integration of Bloom Lake would sustainably fund the 123% increase in the Company’s dividend (announced on the first day of the Settlement Class Period), while also paying for an expansion that would triple the mine’s production volume. The Amended Complaint further alleges that the price of Cliff’s common stock was artificially inflated as a result of Defendants’ allegedly false and misleading statements and omissions, and declined when the truth was revealed. The Class Period is from 3-14-2012 to 3-26-2013. | **6-30-2016** | **For more information write to:****Bernstein Litowitz Berger** **& Grossmann LLP****James A. Harrod, Esq.****1251 Avenue of the** **Americas****44th Floor****New York, New York 10020****Lowenstein Sandler LLP****Michael T.G. Long, Esq.****65 Livingston Avenue****Roseland, NJ 07068** |
| **3-22-2016** | **15-CV-120** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Ioime v. Blanchard, Merriam, Adel & Kirkland, P.A.**Consumer-plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated federal and state debt collectionlaw in that the standardized collection letters sent to consumers (i) improperly required consumers to dispute the validity of their debts in writing; (ii) threatened the filing of a Claim of Lien on the debtor's home without intending to do so; (iii) improperly included conflicting amounts due; and (iv) attempted to collect "Processing Fees" that were not authorized by the Declaration of the underlying creditor, Ocala Palms. The Class Period is from 3-17-2013 to 12-21-2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Varnell & Warwick, P.A.****Steven T. Simmons****P.O. BOX 1870****LADY LAKE, FL 32158****352 753-8600 (Ph.)****ssimmons@varnellandwarwick.com** |
| **3-23-2016** | **14-CV-612** | **(S.D. Ohio)** | **LR Trust v. DiPaolo, et al.****Re Defendants: R.G. Barry Corporation (“R.G. Barry” or the “Company”), David L. Nichols, David P. Lauer, Greg Tunney, Harvey A. Weinberg, Janice E. Page, Nicholas DiPaolo, and Thomas M. Von Lehman (collectively, the R.G. Barry Defendants”)**Securities-purchaser-plaintiff alleges, among other things, that the members of the R.G. Barry Board of Directors breached their fiduciary duties in connection with the Merger by: (i) failing to run an adequate sales process, failing to appropriately consider a potentially superior bid from another party, and ultimately agreeing to inadequate Merger consideration; (ii) including in the Merger Agreement deal protection devices that benefit Mill Road; and (iii) making materially misleading statements and/or failing to disclose material information in the Preliminary Proxy that LR Trust contends is necessary for R.G. Barry shareholders to make a fully informed decision how to vote on the Merger, including, among other things, information regarding the background of the Merger and the financial analysis performed by Peter J. Solomon Company L.P. (“PJSC”), the Company’s financial advisor. The Class Period is from 5-2-2014 to 9-3-2014. | **8-9-2016** | **For more information write, call or fax:****John C. Camillus****LAW OFFICE OF JOHN C.**  **CAMILLUS, LLC****P.O. Box 141410****Columbus, Ohio 43214****614 558-7254 (Ph.)****614 559-6731 (Fax)** |
| **3-24-2016** | **15-CV-01143** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Steven Russell, et al., v. Kohl’s Department Stores, Inc.**Consumer-plaintiffs allege that Kohl’s engaged in false price comparison advertising by using false “original” and/or “regular” prices to advertise its products, in violation of various California laws that prohibit false advertising and unfair competition. The Class Period is from 6-11-2011 to present. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Christopher J. Morosoff****77-735 California Drive****Palm Desert, CA 92211****760 469-5986 (Ph.)****760 345-1581 (Fax)** |
| **3-25-2016** | **12-CV-00944** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Retiree Support Group of Contra County, et al. v. Contra Costa County** Retiree-plaintiffs alleged a number of different legal claims -- breach of contract, promissory estoppel, and due process violation and impairment of contract claims under both the California and Federal constitutions. Retiree Support Group (“RSG”) is a non-profit membership organization consisting of retirees from public service in Contra Costa County, their spouses, their survivors, and their domestic partners. In the lawsuit, RSG alleged that starting in 1992, the County entered into a number of Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with its employee unions that included implied promises to pay at least 80% of the costs of medical benefits for retirees and their dependents under at least one of the health plans offered through the County. RSG alleged that the County was obligated to do so for the lifetimes of the retirees. RSG also alleged that the County was bound by the same promises to retirees who had not been represented by unions while employed by the County. The lawsuit claimed that the County breached these contracts starting in 10-1-2010 when it began to require retirees to pay a higher percentage of their health care costs. The Class is described as: all eligible County retired employees receiving County retiree health benefits who retired on or before 12-31-2015. | **9-8-2016** | **For more information write or e-mail:****KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.****JEFFREY LEWIS (SBN 66587)****300 Lakeside Drive****Suite 1000****Oakland, CA 94612****jlewis@kellerrohrback.com** |
| **3-25-2016** | **13-CV-01241** | **(D.N.M.)** | **David Willett, et al. v. Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc., et al.****Re Defendant: Redflex Traffic Systems, Inc.; Creditwatch Services Ltd.; Creditwatch Oversight LLC; CWGP, LLC; and Credit Control, LLC (collectively, “Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants are responsible for calls placed to cellular telephones in efforts to collect unpaid Albuquerque red light camera traffic fines in violation of the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act. The Class is described as allpersons and entitieswho received one or more telephone calls on their cellular telephones that were placed by Creditwatch Services, Ltd. in efforts to collect unpaid City of Albuquerque traffic fines using an automatic telephone dialing system and/or prerecorded or artificial voice. The Class Period is from 8-21-2010 to 1-15-2016. | **Not set yet** | **For more information****Write to:****Keith J. Keogh****Keogh Law Ltd.****55 W. Monroe****Suite 3390****Chicago, IL 60603** |
| **3-25-2016** | **15-CV-002854** | **(S.D. Ohio)** | **Eric Gilbert v. Abercrombie & Fitch Co., et al.****Re Defendants: Abercrombie & Fitch Co. (“ANF”), Arthur C. Martinez, James B. Bachmann, Bonnie R. Brooks, Terry L. Burman, Sarah M. Gallager, Michael E. Greenlees, Archie M. Griffin, Charles R. Perrin, Stephanie M. Shern, Craig R. Stapleton and Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (collectively “the Defendants”)**Stockholder-plaintiff alleges breach of fiduciary duty against the Individual Defendants due to the inclusion of certain provisions in two credit agreements entered into by ANF, Wells Fargo and a group of lenders on 8-7-2014 (the “2014 Credit Agreements”). The Class Plaintiff asserted a separate claim against Wells Fargo for aiding and abetting the Individual Defendants’ alleged breach of fiduciary duty. The Class is described as all persons who held common stock of Abercrombie ANF from 8-7-2014 to date of Preliminary Approval. | **6-28-2016** | **For more information write to:****Eric L. Zagarf****Kessler Topaz Meltzer &**  **Check, LLP****280 King of Prussia Road****Radnor, PA 19087** |
| **3-25-2016** | **12-CV-5558** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Barbara Keiler, et al. v. Harlequin Enterprises Limited, et al.****Re Defendants: Harlequin Books S.A., and Harlequin Books B.V. (collectively, “Harlequin”)**Consumer-plaintiffs contend that calculating the amount due to authors under an All Other Rights clause is complicated by the relationship between various Harlequin entities. Authors entered into publishing agreements with foreign subsidiaries, Harlequin Books S.A. or Harlequin Enterprises B.V. (which, for simplicity, are referred to in the Notice as “Harlequin Switzerland”). The publishing agreements define Harlequin Switzerland as the “Publisher.” Harlequin Switzerland then licensed the works to Harlequin Enterprises (a “Related Licensee” under the publishing agreements), which in turn actually published the works as e-books. Thus, the royalties paid to authors for e-book sales has been calculated at 50% of the amount paid by Harlequin Enterprises to Harlequin Switzerland, which Plaintiffs contend is less than the amount reasonably obtainable from an unrelated licensee. The Class is described as: all persons, and their heirs and assigns, in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, the Republic of Ireland, Australia, and New Zealand, who during the period 1990 to 2004, entered into a standard form book publishing agreement with Defendant Harlequin Enterprises B.V., or Defendant Harlequin Books S.A. that contained an All Other Rights clause, substantially and materially as described by this CAFA Notice.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****David B. Wolf****David Wolf Law PLLC****One Grand Central Place****60 East 42nd Street****Suite 4700****New York, NY 10165****212 485-9808 (Ph.)****Michael J. Boni****John E. Sindoni****Boni & Zack LLC****15St. Asaphs Road****Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004****610 822-0200 (Ph.)** |
| **3-25-2016** | **11-CV-00733** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Pennsylvania Public School Employees’ Retirement System v. Bank of America Corp., et al.** Securities-purchaser-plaintiffs allege that some or all of the Defendants violated Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 (the “Securities Act”) and Section 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”). Lead Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the federal securities law by allegedly misrepresenting and concealing the magnitude of the Company’s potential exposure to demands to repurchase mortgage-backed securities and other mortgage loans that had been sold by BoA and Countrywide Financial Corporation, and alleged risks to BoA arising from its use of and reliance upon a national electronic database that tracks changes in mortgage servicing rights and beneficial ownership interests in loans secured by residential real estate. The Class Period is from 2-27-2009 to 10-19-2010. | **7-20-2016** | **For more information write to:****Barrack, Rodos & Bacine** **Mark R. Rosen****Jeffrey A. Barrack****Jeffrey B. Gittleman****Two Commerce Square****2001 Market Street****Suite 3300****Philadelphia, PA 19103** |
| **3-28-2016** | **15-CV-01629** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Munday v. Navy Federal Credit Union**Plaintiff alleges that Navy Federal Credit Union (“NFCU”) violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq., because calls were made to cellular telephones using an automatic telephone dialing system without consumers’ prior express consent. Plaintiff alleges that NFCU would call cellular phone numbers searching for someone else and continued to call after being informed NFCU was calling the wrong number. The Class Period is from 10-9-2011 to date of Preliminary Approval. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Sergei Lemberg****43 Danbury Road****Wilton, CT 06897****855 301-2100 (Ph.)** |
| **3-28-2016** | **09-CV-02338** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **EK Vathana v. EverBank, et al.**This notice supplements the original notice from Goodwin Proctor, setting a Final Fairness Hearing Date. For more information see CAFA Notice dated 3-4-2016. | **7-7-2016** | **For more information write or call:****Michael Millen****119 Calle Marguerita #100****Los Gatos, CA 95032****408 871-0777 (Ph.)** |
| **3-28-2016** | **15-CV-02058** | **(D. Minn.)** | **Neil Kran v. Hearst Communications, Inc., et al.**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants placed telephone calls to certain individuals whose numbers were registered on the Do Not Call List, in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. The Class is described as: all individuals in the United States (1) who had his or her telephone number(s) registered with the National Do Not Call Registry for at least thirty days prior to the first Telephone Call, (2) who received more than one Telephone Call within a twelve-month period, (3) who were not a subscriber to the San Francisco Chronicle for a period of at least 18 months prior to the first Telephone Call (or who have never subscribed at all). A “Telephone Call” is any call to a telephone number registered with the National Do Not Call Registry more than thirty (30) days after its registration placed by either Hearst or A Marketing Resource, LLC purportedly on behalf of Hearst to promote subscriptions or the renewal of subscriptions to Hearst’s San Francisco Chronicle newspaper. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Benjamin H. Richman****EDELSON PC****350 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1300****Chicago, IL 60654** |
| **3-28-2016** | **14-CV-01290** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Martin, et al. v. Global Marketing Research Services, Inc., et al.**Plaintiffs allege that GMRS made calls to cellphones in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227. The Class Representatives claim that GMRS called cellphone users without their prior express consent to conduct its research surveys. The Class Period is from 8-10-2010 to 12-31-2014. | **Not set yet**  | **For more information write or call:****Steven Woodrow, Esq.****Class Counsel****Woodrow & Peluso, LLC****3900 East Mexico Ave.****Ste. 300****Denver, CO 80210****720 213-0675 (Ph.)** |
| **3-31-2016** | **10-CV-00107** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **Donna K. Soutter, et al. v. Equifax Information Services LLC****Brenda Arnold, et al. v. Equifax Information Services LLC** Consumer-plaintiffs sued Equifax alleging that Equifax violated the federal Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA). The FCRA requires Equifax to “follow reasonable procedures to assure maximum possible accuracy” of every credit report it sells. 15 U.S.C. § 1681e(b). Plaintiffs have alleged that Equifax systemically failed to include records that Virginia General District Court judgments had been satisfied, vacated, dismissed or appealed in its credit reports and that this violated the FCRA. The Class Period is from 1-1-2003 to date of Preliminary Approval. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Leonard A. Bennett****Consumer Litigation**  **Associates, P.C.****763 J. Clyde Morris Blvd. Suite 1-A****Newport News, VA 23601** |