|  **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4-2-2018** | **13-CV-1836** | **(W.D. Wash.)** | **In re: Atossa Genetics, Inc. Securities Litigation**Plaintiff alleges that Atossa and Quay made materially false and misleading statements to Atossa investors in violation of Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended by the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, 15 U.S.C. §§ 78j (b), 78t (a), and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5 (the "Exchange Act").  | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write or call:****Jeffrey C. Block****Jacob A. Walker****BLOCK & LEVITON LLP****155 Federal Street Suite 400****Boston, MA 02110****617 398-5600 (Ph.)** |
| **4-3-2018** | **12-CV-2311** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Auto Parts Antitrust Litigation (Instrument Panel Cloisters)**Plaintiffs bring this lawsuit as a proposed class action against the Defendants, manufacturers and suppliers of Instrument Panel Clusters globally and in the United States, for engaging in a lengthy conspiracy 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 these products, which were sold to automobile manufacturers in the United States and elsewhere. The Defendants’ conspiracy successfully targeted the United States automotive industry, raising prices for car manufacturers as well as car and truck dealers. | **Not set yet**Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **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****LARSON • KING, LLP****2800 Wells Fargo Place****30 East Seventh Street****St. Paul, MN 55101** |
| **4-5-2018** | **16-CV-00085** | **(M.D. Pa.)** | **Canfield v. Statoil USA Onshore Properties, Inc.**Plaintiffs claim that Statoil underpaid Royalties relating to gas produced from wells located in Pennsylvania pursuant to certain provisions of oil and gas leases. The Action alleges that Statoil inappropriately used an Index Pricing Methodology on which to base its Royalty payments rather than a Resale Price. Plaintiffs sought monetary damages and prejudgment interest. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Douglas A. Clark****The Clark Law Firm, P.C.****1563 Main Street****Peckville, PA 18452****Francis P. Karam****Robbins Geller Rudman** **& Dowd LLP****58 South Service Road Suite 200****Melville, NY 11747** |
| **4-5-2018** | **17-CV-00155** | **(D. Colo.)** | **Amedee v. Level 3 Communications, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Jeff K. Storey, James O. Ellis, Jr., Kevin P. Chilton, Steven T. Clontz, Irene M. Esteves, T. Michael Glenn, Spencer B. Hays, Michael Mahoney, Kevin W. Mooney, Peter Seahlimhuat and Peter VanOppen (collectively, “Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that Level 3 and the Director Defendants violated Sections 14(a) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 14a-9 promulgated thereunder because the Preliminary Proxy failed to disclose material information relating to the proposed transaction. Plaintiff’s complaint (the “Complaint”) sought, among other things, injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants from consummating the proposed transaction, and other forms of equitable relief. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Richard A. Acocelli****WEISSLAW LLP****1500 Broadway, 16th Floor****New York, NY 10036****212 628-3025 (Ph.)****Donald J. Enright****LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP****1101 30th Street, N.W.Suite 115****Washington, DC 20007****202 524-4290 (Ph.)** |
| **4-5-2018** | **11-CV-5450** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Mayor and City Council of Baltimore v. Bank of America Corporation, et al.****Re Defendant: HSBC Bank plc (“HSBC”)**Plaintiffs allege that the banks manipulated the U.S. Dollar LIBOR rate during the financial crisis, artificially lowering the rate for their own benefit. Plaintiffs claim that Citibank and other banks manipulated the U.S. Dollar LIBOR rate, and that, as a result, purchasers did not receive as much interest payments for their U.S. Dollar LIBOR-based instruments from the banks as they should have. Citibank, Barclays, and the Non-Settling Defendants deny these claims and maintain they did nothing wrong. Plaintiffs in the OTC Action have brought (a) antitrust claims under the Sherman Act, (b) breach of contract claims, and (c) unjust enrichment claims against Citibank, Barclays, and the Non-Settling Defendants. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Arun Subramanian****William Christopher** **Carmody****Susman Godfrey L.L.P.****560 Lexington Avenue****15th Floor****New York, NY 10022****212 336-8330 (Ph.)****212 336-8340 (Fax)** |
| **4-5-2018** | **16-CV-02558** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Zamora et al. v. Lyft, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that Lyft improperly charged commissions on “Prime Time” premiums added to fares during periods of high demand and that, as a result of this, Lyft violated various laws and contracts. The lawsuit also claims, generally, that Lyft improperly classified drivers who gave rides in California as independent contractors rather than employees and that as a result of this classification Lyft violated various laws and regulations. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Jahan C. Sagafi****Rachel Bien****OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP****One Embarcadero Center****38th Floor****San Francisco, CA 94111****415 638-8800 (Ph.)****415 638-8810 (Fax)** |
| **4-6-2014** | **14-CV-00832** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **Meta v. Target Corporation, et al.****Re Defendant: Nice-Pak Products, Inc. (“Nice-Pak”) (collectively, “Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that certain Up & Up flushable toddler wipes sold from 4-18-2010 through 10-31-2014 were not “flushable.” Target and Nice-Pak deny Plaintiff’s claims and contend that the Up & Up flushable toddler wipes at issue were in fact “flushable.” | **8-7-2018** | **For more information visit:**[**www.upandupwipessettlement.com**](http://www.upandupwipessettlement.com) |
| **4-9-2018** | **14-CV-00494** | **(D. Oregon)** | **Roderick C. Demmings v. KKW Trucking**Plaintiff alleges that KKW violated certain provisions of the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681, et seq. in connection with its use of Consumer Reports. Specifically the Civil Action alleges that KKW violated the following: 1) 15 U.S.C. § 1681(b)(2)(B) by failing to advise the applicant verbally, in writing, or by electronic means of his right to a free copy of the report within 60 days, and his report to dispute the accuracy or completeness of the report directly with the consumer reporting agency before procuring a consumer report; and 2) 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(3)(B) by failing to provide adverse action notice to truck driving applicants within 3 days of KKW taking adverse action based in whole or in part on information contained in a consumer report. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Matthew A. Dooley** **Anthony R. Pecora** **O’TOOLE, MCLAUGHLIN, DOOLEY** **& PECORA CO., LPA** **5455 Detroit Road** **Sheffield Village, OH 44054** |
| **4-9-2018** | **14-CV-01564** | **(M.D. Tenn.)** | **Burges, et al. v. Bancorpsouth, Inc., et al.**Plaintiff alleges that Checkr violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act (“FCRA”) by allegedly producing background reports on individuals containing non-conviction information older than seven years from the date of the report. Plaintiff alleges that this reporting caused harm and violated the law. | **9-21-2018** | **For more information write to:****E. Michelle Drake****Berger & Montahgue P.C.****43 SE Main Street****Suite 505****Minneapolis, MN 55414** |
| **4-9-2018** | **12-CV-21468** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Mollicone v. Universal Handicraft, et al.**This lawsuit alleges violations of consumer protection and warranty laws, and claims that Defendants misrepresented the anti-aging benefits of certain Adore Organic Innovation products marketed, in the United States, as containing a plant stem cell formula. | **8-10-2018** | **For more information call or visit :** **1-877-752-6801 (Ph.)**[**www.PlantStemCellSettlement.com**](http://www.PlantStemCellSettlement.com) |
| **4-9-2018** | **14-MD-2503** | **(D. Mass.)** | **In re: Solodyn Antitrust Litigation**The lawsuit alleges Medicis, delayed the availability of an allegedly less-expensive generic version through allegedly anticompetitive agreements with the other Defendants. Plaintiffs (those who brought the suit) allege that Defendants did so through the unlawful settlement of patent lawsuits in which the patents covering Solodyn were in dispute. Plaintiffs claim that Defendants’ actions denied End-Payors who paid for Solodyn® the benefits of competition and caused them to pay higher prices for Solodyn® than they otherwise would have. | **7-11-2018** | **For more information write, visit or call:****Michael M. Buchman****MOTLEY RICE LLC****600 Third Avenue****Suite 2101****New York, NY 10016**[**www.SolodynCase.com**](http://www.SolodynCase.com)**1 800 332-7414 (Ph.)** |
| **4-10-2018** | **14-CV-02400** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Koller v. Deoleo USA, Inc.**The lawsuit alleges that that Deoleo marketed and sold its Bertolli brand of olive oil with the representation “Imported from Italy,” although most of the oil was extracted in countries other than Italy, from olives grown in those countries. The lawsuit also alleged that, with respect to the olive oil labeled “Extra Virgin,” Deoleo’s procurement, bottling, and distribution practices did not adequately ensure that the oil would meet the “extra virgin” standard through the date of retail sale or the “best by” date on the bottles. The lawsuit challenged the alleged misrepresentations on behalf of plaintiff and consumers who bought the Products. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call fax or e-mail:****Adam Gutride****Seth Safier****Gutride Safier LLP****100 Pine Street****Suite 1250****San Francisco, CA 94111****415 639-9090 (Ph.)****415 449-6469 (Fax)****adam@gutridesafier.com****seth@gutridesafier.com** |
| **4-11-2018** | **17-CV-1469** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Sackin, et al. v. TransPerfect Global, Inc.** Plaintiffs in this matter claim that on or about 1-17-2017, TransPerfect disclosed that it was the victim of a phishing attack resulting in the disclosure of Form W-2 data and payroll information (“Personal Data”) concerning individuals who work for or had worked for TransPerfect and certain corporate affiliates (the “Data Breach”). Plaintiffs claim that TransPerfect did not adequately protect their personal information, and that they were injured as a result of the Data Breach. | **8-16-2018** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Jeremiah Frei-Pearson****Todd S. Garber****John D. Sardesai-Grant****Difie M. Osborne****445 Hamilton Avenue****Suite 605****White Plains, New York 10601****914 298-3281 (Ph.)****914 824-1561 (Fax)** |
| **4-11-2018** | **12-MD-02311****12-CV-00601****16-CV-10002** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Occupant Safety Systems (Direct Purchaser Action)****Re Defendants: Tokai Rika Co., Ltd. and TRAM. Inc., a/k/a Tokai Rika U.S.A. Inc. (collectively “Tokai Rika”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants entered into a conspiracy to suppress and eliminate competition for Occupant Safety Systems by agreeing to fix, maintain or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate the supply of Occupant Safety Systems, in violation of federal antitrust laws. Plaintiffs further allege that as a result of the conspiracy they and other direct purchasers of Occupant Safety Systems have been injured by paying more for those products that 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. | **9-26-2018** | **For more information visit:**[**www.autopartsantitrustlitigation.com**](http://www.autopartsantitrustlitigation.com) |
| **4-12-2018** | **17-CV-05987** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Gregorio v. Premier Nutrition Corporation**Plaintiff alleges that Defendant formulates, manufactures, advertises and sells the popular “Premier Protein” branded ready-to-drink (“RTD”) protein product and protein bars (collectively the “Products”) throughout the United States, including in New York. Defendant markets its Products in a systematically misleading manner, by misrepresenting that its Products have specific amounts of protein that they do not in fact contain (the “Misrepresentations”). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Philip L. Fraietta** **Frederick J. Klorczyk III** **BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.** **888 Seventh Avenue** **New York, New York 10019** **212 989-9113 (Ph.)****212 989-9163 (Fax)** |
| **4-12-2018** | **17-CV-01635** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Charles Dooner, et al. v. Haier US Appliance Solutions, Inc.**The Lawsuit alleges that Haier violated the federal Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”) and various state laws by failing to pay service technicians for all hours worked. Specifically, the Lawsuit contends Haier failed to pay service technicians for pre-shift computer work and drive time to the first customer of the day. Plaintiffs also contend that service technicians were no longer performing this uncompensated work after 6-30-2017. Claims prior to 2017 were settled in a separate lawsuit, *Maddy v.**General Electric Co.* Thus, the Lawsuit seeks damages during the 6-month period from 1-1-2017 through 6-30-2017.  | **7-11-2018** | **For more information write or visit:****Justin L. Swidler****Richard S. Swartz****Swartz Swidler, LLC****1101 Kings Hwy N.****Suite 402****Cherry Hill, NJ 08034**[**http://www.haierlawsuit.com**](http://www.haierlawsuit.com) |
| **4-13-2018** | **17-CV-23006** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Dipuglia v. US Coachways, Inc., (“USC”)**The lawsuit alleges that USC sent text messages to Plaintiff’s wireless telephone number without prior express written consent in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C. § 227 (“TCPA”) and seeks actual and statutory damages under the TCPA on behalf of the named Plaintiff and a class of all individuals in the United States. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Jeff M. Ostrow****Scott Edelsberg****KOPELOWITZ OSTROW****FERGUSON WEISELBERG GILBERT****1 West Las Olas Blvd.****Suite 500****Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301** |
| **4-13-2018** | **16-CV-02900** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Griffith v. ContextMedia, Inc.**The lawsuit alleges that ContextMedia Health, LLC sent text messages to Plaintiff’s wireless telephone number without prior express written consent and in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 (“TCPA”). The text messages at issue in the litigation were sent from Defendant’s “Healthy Tips” service, through which Defendant would send to Class Members’ cell phones a text message containing a nutrition tip each day. Specifically, the lawsuit alleges that the Defendant continued to send these text messages after Class Members had replied “STOP” or “STOP CMH TIPS.” | **11-16-2018** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Jeremy M. Glapion****The Glapion Law Firm, LLC****1704 Maxwell Drive****Wall, New Jersey 07719****732 455-9737 (Ph.)****jmg@glapionlaw.com** |
| **4-17-2018** | **17-CV-193** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Dana Chapman v. McCabe Law Group, P.A.**Plaintiff alleged that Settlement Defendant violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, by attempting to collect a debt using letters that failed to properly inform the consumer as to the consumer's right to debt verification in a manner which was not reasonably calculated to confuse or frustrate the least sophisticated consumer in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692g. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Robert W. Murphy****1212 S.E. 2nd Avenue****Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316****954 763-8660 (Ph.)****nvmurphy@lawfirmmurphy.com** |
| **4-17-2018** | **12-MD-02311****12-CV-00603****13-CV-01303****13-CV-01603** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Heater Control Panels, Occupant Safety Systems, Switches and Steering Angle Sensors (End-Payor Action)****Re Defendants: Tokai Rika Co., Ltd. and TRAM, Inc., a/k/a/ Tokai Rika U.S.A. Inc. (collectively, “Topkai Rika”)**Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of Tokai Rika’s participation in unlawful conspiracies to raise, fix, maintain, and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for (1) Heating Control Panels (as defined below) 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 End-Payor Plaintiffs’ Third Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint (Case No. 2:12-cv-00403, Doc. No. 229) (“Heating Control Panels Complaint”), (2) Occupant Safety Restraint Systems (as defined below) in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act and various state antitrust, unfair competition, unjust enrichment, andconsumer protection laws as set forth in End-Payor Plaintiffs’ Third Consolidated AmendedClass Action Complaint (Case No. 2:12-cv-00603, Doc. No. 181) (“Occupant Safety Restraint Systems Complaint”), (3) Switches (as defined below) 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 End-Payor Plaintiffs’ SecondConsolidated Amended Class Action Complaint(Case No. 2:13-cv-01303, Doc. No. 122) (“Switches Complaint”), and (4) Steering AngleSensors (as defined below) in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act and various stateantitrust, unfair competition, unjust enrichment, and consumer protection laws as set forth in End-Payor Plaintiffs’ Second Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint (Case No. 2:13-cv-01603, Doc. No. 90) (“Steering Angle Sensors Complaint”) (together, “Complaints”). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Cotchett, Pitre, &** **McCarthy LLP****San Francisco Airport Office** **Center****840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200****Burlingame, CA 94010****Robins Kaplan LLP****399 Park Avenue, Suite 3600****New York, NY 10022****Susman Godfrey L.L.P.****1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 950****Los Angeles, CA 90067** |
| **4-18-2018** | **16-CV-551****17-CV-1093** | **(S.D. Ohio)** | **Alma Bojorquez, et al. v. Abercrombie and Fitch Co., et al.**Plaintiffs allege that Abercrombie violated state wage and hour laws of California including failure to indemnify business expenses for uniforms, inaccurate wage statements, waiting time penalties, and minimum wage violations. On 12-15-2015 Plaintiffs’ counsel filed a broader companion case on behalf of persons in the remaining 49 states, claiming that Abercrombie violated the Fair Labor Standards Act (the “FLSA”) and the state wage and hour laws of New York, Florida, and Massachusetts, based on similar allegations to those made in the California litigation. Specifically, Plaintiffs allege that they and the Class Members were improperly denied reimbursement for money they spent to purchase Abercrombie clothes as a direct result of being compelled or required by Abercrombie to make the purchase, including to conform with Abercrombie’s Look Policy, and therefore were improperly denied compensation. | **7-25-2018** | **For more information write to:****Randall B. Aiman-Smith****Reed W. L. Marcy****Hallie Von Rock****Carey S. James****Aiman-Smith &Marcy****7677 Oakport Street****Suite 1150****Oakland, CA 94621** |
| **4-18-2018** | **17-CV-02070** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **Leary v. McGowen Enterprises Inc. (“MEI”)**The lawsuit alleges that MEI violated the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act by including an illegal tying provision in a written warranty provided to Named Plaintiffs and Class Members. At issue is MEI’s LifeTime Engine Guarantee, which is a limited warranty that covers a vehicle’s engine from mechanical failure or abnormal wear so long as the purchaser owns the vehicle, provided that the purchaser properly maintains the vehicle in accordance with the warranty’s terms. Among other things, the LifeTime Engine Guarantee directs Named Plaintiffs and Class Members to have the oil changed professionally in their vehicle every four months or 4,000 miles, whichever comes first, using only Castrol oil products. Plaintiffs allege that they and all Class Members paid more for oil changes than they should have paid because Castrol oil may be more expensive than comparable oil products and that they should be allowed to change the oil not only with Castrol oil products, but with similar oil products, without voiding the warranty. | **10-2-2018** | **For more information write to:****Michael McKay****Schneider Wallae Cottrell**  **Konecky Wotkyns LLP****8501 N. Scottsdale Road****Suite 270****Scottsdale, Arizona 85253** |
| **4-19-2018** | **14-CV-894** | **(E.D. Tex.)** | **Singh v. 21Vianet Group, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants made a number of material misstatements and omissions through press releases, SEC filings, and conference calls that misled investors with respect to the financial strength of 21Vianet. More specifically, the Complaint alleges that Defendants engaged in the “round-tripping” of revenue. As used by Lead Plaintiff in the Complaint, “round-tripping” refers to a revenue-inflation scheme whereby 21Vianet allegedly distributed money through loans or commercial transactions to companies affiliated with other companies 21Vianet wanted to acquire. Then, after the acquisition, the affiliated companies allegedly would funnel the money to the acquired company, which allegedly allowed 21Vianet to record the inflow as revenue on its consolidated financial statements. Lead Plaintiff alleged this happened multiple times between 2013 and 2016 and that Defendants’ material misstatements and omissions on the topic artificially inflated the price of21Vianet’s publicly-traded ADSs during the Class Period. The Complaint further alleged that the price of 21Vianet publicly-traded ADSs were artificially inflated as a result of Defendants’ allegedly false and misleading statements, and declined when the truth was revealed. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Glancy Prongay &** **Murray LLP****Ex Kano S. Sams II****1925 Century Park East****Suite 2100****Los Angeles, CA 90067** |
| **4-19-2018** | **12-CV-5567** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Russell Dover, et al. v. British Airways Plc.**Plaintiffs filed a lawsuit in which they alleged that British Airways charged fuel surcharges to Settlement Class Members of frequent flyer reward flights that breached the Executive Club Contract. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion call or visit:****1 833 261-2496 (Ph.)**[**www.fuelsurchargeclassaction.com**](http://www.fuelsurchargeclassaction.com) |
| **4-20-2018** | **17-CV-00118** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Luis Valdivieso, et al. v. Cushman & Wakefield, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that Defendant violated the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”) and Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (“COBRA”) by providing a COBRA election notice to the putative class members which did not fully comply with the notice requirements of COBRA. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Luis A. Cabassa****Brandon J. Hill****Wenzel Fenton Cabassa,.**  **P.A.****1110 N. Florida Avenue****Suite 300****Tampa, FL 33602** |
| **4-20-2018** | **17-CV-00152** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Marcus Chism v. PEPSICO, Inc.****Re Defendants: Frito-Lay, Inc and First Advantage Background Services Corp.**The Lawsuit claimed that Defendant conducted background checks on applicants using disclosure forms that failed to comply with various federal and California laws, including the Fair Credit Reporting Act, the California Investigative Consumer Reporting Agencies Act, and the California Consumer Credit Reporting Agencies Act. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Setareh Law Group****Shaun Setareh****Thomas Segal****9454 Wilshire Blvd.****Suite 907****Beverly Hills, CA 90212** |
| **4-23-2018** | **16-CV-00410** | **(E.D. Okla.)** | **John Cecil v. B.P. America Production Company**Plaintiff alleges BP knowingly and systematically underpaid royalties to Plaintiff and the putative class members through a policy of paying no royalty for Fuel Gas, which BP implemented by failing to disclose to Plaintiff and other putative class members on their monthly royalty check stubs that BP was not paying royalty on Fuel Gas. Plaintiff seeks to recover the royalty BP owes it and the putative class for its breach of express covenants to pay royalties on Fuel Gas. In this case, Plaintiff brings claims against BP for breach of contract, tortious breach of contract, unjust enrichment, fraud (actual and constructive) and deceit, accounting, and injunction. | **9-25-2018** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Reagan E Bradford****The Lanier Law Firm****100 E. California Avenue****Suite 200****Oklahoma City, OK 73104****713 659-5200 (Ph.)****Reagan.bradford@lanierlawfirm.com** |
| **4-23-2018** | **14-CV-3084** | **(S.D. Tex.)** | **In re: Willbros Group, Inc. Securities Litigation**Lead Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by, *inter alia*, issuing false and misleading statements or failing to disclose material adverse facts about the performance of two pipeline projects, the existence and effectiveness of internal controls, the Company’s Q1 and Q2 2014 financials, and the Company’s liquidity and debt covenant compliance. Lead Plaintiffs further allege that as a result of Defendants’ false and misleading statements and omissions, Willbros’ stock traded at artificially inflated prices during the Settlement Class Period. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****ROBBINS GELLER**  **RUDMAN & DOWD LLP****ELLEN GUSIKOFF STEWART****655 West Broadway****Suite 1900****San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **4-23-2018** | **15-CV-04878** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Merced Irrigation District v. Barclay Bank PLC.**Plaintiff alleges that Barclay unreasonably restrained trade in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, unlawfully monopolized or attempted to monopolize markets in violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act, engaged in acts and practices in violation of California Business & Profession Code Section 17200, and that Defendant was unjustly enriched as a result of is conduct. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Solomon B. Cera****Cera LLP****595 Market Street****Suite 2300****San Francisco, CA 94105****415 977-2230 (Ph.)****screa@cerallp.com** |
| **4-24-2018** | **17-CV-00007** | **(D. Conn.)** | **Pablo Rincon-Marin v. Credit Control, LLC**This lawsuit alleges Credit Control violated a federal law known as the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (“FDCPA”) by mailing letters to collect a debt that stated both that, “Please note that a negative credit bureau report reflecting on your credit record may be submitted to a credit reporting agency by the current account owner if you fail to fulfill the terms of your credit obligations. This notice in no way affects any rights you may have” and “The law limits how long you can be sued on a debt. Because of the age of your debt, LVNV Funding LLC will not sue you for it and LVNV Funding LLC will not report it to any credit reporting agency.” Plaintiffs’ complaint alleges Credit Control’s letters violated the FDCPA’s prohibition on false or misleading representations. | **7-26-2018** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Daniel Zemel** **Zemel Law, LLC** **78 John Miller Way****Suite 430** **Kearny, New Jersey 07032****862 227-3106 (Ph.)****dz@zemellawllc.com****Peter Van Dyke** **Eagan, Donohue, Van Dyke** **& Falsey, LLP** **24 Arapahoe Road** **West Hartford, CT 06107****215 872-5127 (Ph.)****pvd@eddf-law.com** |
| **4-25-2018** | **15-CV-12838** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **Brian Martin v. Trott Law P.C. and David A. Trott**The Complaint alleges that the Trott PC Foreclosure Letters (which Defendants refer to as “fair debt letters”), violate both statutes in each of three ways: (i) by misleadinglysuggesting that they were from an attorney when no attorney had engaged in a “meaningfully review” of homeowners’ accounts before the letters were sent; (ii) by “overshadowing,” in a subset of the letters mentioning possible reinstatement of the mortgage, the federal validation rights of homeowners (e.g., the right to dispute or seek certain information about the debt within 30 days); and (iii) by use of the misleading undefined phrase “Corporate Advances” in a subset of the letters. | **9-27-2018** | **For more information visit:**[**www.TrottFairDebtSettlement.com**](http://www.TrottFairDebtSettlement.com) |
| **4-25-2018** | **16-CV-02422** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Ralph Lamones v. HumanResource ProFile, Inc.**The Court has scheduled a Final Approval Hearing. For more information see CAFA Notice dated 2-2-2018. | **9-25-2018** | **For more information write to:****Nichols Kaster****Attn: Brock Specht****4600 IDS Center****80 South8th Street****Minneapolis, MN 55402** |
| **4-26-2018** | **15-CV-04912** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Raffin v. Medicredit, Inc., et al.****Re Defendant: The Outsource Group, Inc.**The Lawsuit alleges that Medicredit recorded phone calls it made to cellular telephones without the recipients’ consent in violation of the Invasion of Privacy Act, California Penal Code. § 630 et seq. (“IPA”), and alleges that The Outsource Group is responsible for Medicredit’s alleged conduct.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Todd M. Friedman, Esq.****The Law Offices of**  **Todd M. Friedman, P.C.****21550 Oxnard Street****Suite 780****Woodland Hills, CA 91367** |
| **4-26-2018** | **16-CV-00278** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Elder v. Hilton Worldwide Holdings, Inc.****Re Defendants: Hilton Grand Vacations Company, Inc. (together “Hilton”), and Blackhawk Engagement Solutions, Inc, (collectively, the “Defendants”)**This lawsuit claims that Hilton improperly rejected $100 and $200 SANU certificates provided to people who attended timeshare presentations offered by Hilton. Asserted claims are for breach of express warranty, breach of the implied warranty of merchantability breach of the implied warranty of fitness for a particular purpose, breach of contract, unjust enrichment, and violation of the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act (“CLRA”), violation of the California Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”), violation of the California False Advertising Law, negligent misrepresentation, and fraud. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****L. Timothy Fisher****Bursor & Fisher, P.A.****1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940****Walnut Creek, CA 94596** |
| **4-27-2018** | **14-CV-03264** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Capacitors Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Nippon Chemi-Con Corporation and United Chemi-Con, Inc., (collectively, the “Chemi-Con Defendants”**The lawsuit alleges that Defendants and co-conspirators conspired to raise and fix the prices of Capacitors for more than ten years, resulting in overcharges to indirect purchasers of Capacitors. 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 Capacitors by, among other things, face-to-face meetings and other communications, customer allocation, and the use of trade associations. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion visit or call:**[**WWW.CAPACITORSINDIRECTCASE.COM**](http://WWW.CAPACITORSINDIRECTCASE.COM)**1 866 217-4245 (Ph.)** |
| **4-30-2018** | **15-CV-12838** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **Brian J. Martin, et al. v. Trott Law, P.C., et al.**For more information CAFA Notice on page 16 above. | **9-27-2018** | **For more information visit:**[**www.TrottFairDebtSettlement.com**](http://www.TrottFairDebtSettlement.com) |
| **4-30-2018** | **14-CV-07155** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Rubenstein v. The Neiman Marcus Group LLC**The lawsuit alleges that consumers weremisled by the “Compared To” price tags on merchandise sold at Last Call outlet stores inCalifornia, to their financial detriment. This case is being brought by Linda Rubenstein, also known as the “Settlement Class Representative” or “Plaintiff.” The Settlement Class Representative sued The Neiman Marcus Group LLC, also known as the “Defendant.”  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Michael Louis Kelly****Behram V. Parekh****Joshua A. Fields****Kirtland & Packard LLP****1638 South Pacific Coast Hwy.****Redondo Beach CA 90277****310 536-1000 (Ph.)****310 536-1001 (Fax)** |
| **4-30-2018** | **17-CV-00121****17-CV-00123****17-CV-00126** | **(E.D. Tex.)** | **Health Choice Advocates, LLC v. Gilead Sciences, Inc. et al.****Health Choice Alliance, LLC v. Eli Lilly and Company, Inc., et al.****Health Choice Group, LLC v. Bayer Corp. et al.**For more information see CAFA Notice above. | **7-18-2018** | **For more information visit or call:**[**www.SolodynCase.com**](http://www.SolodynCase.com)**1 800 332-7414 (Ph.)** |