| **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2-1-2018** | **16-CV-14103**  **13-CV-02311** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **Alpha Corporation and Alpha Technology Corporation (together, “ALPHA”) (End-Payor)**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants Alpha Corporation and Alpha Technology Corporation (together, “Defendants”) and unnamed co-conspirators, manufacturers and/or suppliers of Access Mechanisms globally and in the United States, engaged in a long-running conspiracy to unlawfully fix, artificially raise, maintain and/or stabilize prices, rig bids for, and allocate the market and customers in the United States for Access Mechanisms. | **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** |
| **2-1-2018** | **14-CV-00443** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Levy v. Gutierrez, et al.**  **Re Defendants: Hoil Kim; Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP, on behalf of Thomas Gutierrez, Daniel Squiller and Richard J. Gaynor; Nutter McClennen & Fish LLP, on behalf of Kanwardev Raja Singh Bal; and Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz, on behalf of J. Michal Conaway, Kathleen A. Cote, Ernest L. Godshalk, Matthew E. Massengioll, Mary Petrovich, Robert E. Switz, Noel G. Watson, and Thomas Wroe, Jr. (collectively, the “Individual Defendants”)**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants misled investors about the true nature, progress, and success of GT Advanced Technologies Inc. (“GTAT’s”) joint venture agreement with Apple for the production of sapphire material. The Action further alleges that GTAT investors suffered economic harm when the truth about the Apple agreement was revealed upon the Company’s filing for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection on 10-6-2014. | **Not set yet**  Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more inforamtion write, call or visit:**  **John C. Brown**  **BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER &**  **GROSSMANN LLP**  **1251 Avenue of the Americas, 44th Floor**  **New York, NY 10020**  **800 380-8496 (Ph.)**  [**www.GTATSecuritiesLitigation.com**](http://www.GTATSecuritiesLitigation.com) |
| **2-2-2018** | **14-CV-3471** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Shonntey Moodie v. Maxim ZHealthcare Services, Inc., et al.**  The lawsuit concerns whether Maxim impermissibly accessed consumer credit reports to conduct background checks of individuals applying for employment with Maxim after executing a release and authorization form. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **ZIMMERMAN REED**  **Christopher Ridout**  **Caleb Market**  **2381 Rosecrans Avenue**  **Suite 328**  **Manhattan Beach, CA 90245**  **877 500-8780 (Ph.)** |
| **2-2-2018** | **16-CV-02422** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Ralph Lamones v. Human Resource ProFile, Inc.**  This case is about whether HR ProFiel violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act by including “stale” criminal charges on its background checks that were older than 7 years and that were not convictions. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Nichols Kaster**  **Attn: Brock Specht**  **4600 IDS Center**  **80 South8th Street**  **Minneapolis, MN 55402** |
| **2-2-2018** | **16-CV-04103** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **In re: Access Mechanisms**  End-Payor Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of VALEO's participation in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for Access Mechanisms 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' Consolidated Class Action Complaint in the Action. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Cotchett, Pitre, &**  **McCarthy LLP**  **840 Malcolm Road**  **Burlingame, CA 94010**  **Robins Kaplan LLP**  **399 Park Avenue**  **Suite 3600**  **New York, NY 10022** |
| **2-5-2018** | **16-CV-01109** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Winifred Cabiness v. Educational Financial Solutions, LLC d/b/a Campus Debt Solutions, et al.**  **Re Defendants: Educational Financial Solutions, LLC d/b/a Campus Debt Solutions (”CDS”), Debt.com, LLC (“Debt.com”), Beta Investment Group, Inc. (“Beta”), Equity Acquisitions, LLC (“Equity Acquisitions”), VentureTech Solutions, LLC (VentureTech”) and Howard Dvorkin (“Dvorkin”) (collectively CDS, Debt.com, Beta, Equity Acquisitions, VentureTech and Dvorkin are referred to as “Defendants”)**  This lawsuit alleges that Defendants violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 (the “TCPA”) by allegedly using an automatic telephone dialing system to place unsolicited telemarking calls to cellular phones without prior express written consent. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write, call or e-mail:**  **Bryan Kemnitzer**  **Nancy Barron**  **Elliot Conn**  **KEMNITZER, BARRON &**  **KRIEG, LLP**  **445 Bush St, 6th Floor**  **San Francisco, CA 94108**  **415 632-1900 (Ph.)**  [**elliot@kbklegal.com**](mailto:elliot@kbklegal.com) |
| **2-5-2018** | **7-CV-5634** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Transpacific Passenger Air Transportation Antitrust Litigation**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants and their unnamed co-conspirators began imposing air fare increases, including fuel surcharge increases, on international air passengers. The timing and amount of Defendants’ increases was the product of a collusive agreement to fix, raise, maintain, and stabilize the prices of base passenger fares and fuel surcharges on international flights. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Adam J. Zapala**  **Elizabeth Castillo**  **COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY**  **San Francisco Airport Office**  **Center**  **840 Malcolm Road**  **Suite 200**  **Burlingame, CA 94010**  **650 697-6000 (Ph.)**  **650 697-0577 (Fax)** |
| **2-5-2018** | **6-CV-00620** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **In re: Mushroom Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation**  Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants conspired to fix the price of fresh agaricus mushrooms sold in the non-Western United States (i.e. east of the Rocky Mountains) between 2-4-2001 and 8-8-2005 in violation of the federal antitrust laws. Plaintiffs contend that the Defendants agreed to pricing policies and written price lists that established the price at which Defendants and their affiliated distributors would sell to direct purchasers in each of the six regions that make up the non-Western United States. Plaintiffs further contend that Defendants engaged in a Supply Control Program designed to limit the supply of fresh agaricus mushrooms and increase the price. The Supply Control Program included the acquisition and/or lease of mushroom farms in order to transfer the subject to deed restrictions that prohibited the production of mushrooms on those properties. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Garwin Gerstein &**  **Fisher LLP**  **88 Pine Street**  **10th Floor**  **New York, NY 10005** |
| **2-5-2018** | **14-CV-02004**  **17-CV-4776** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Anthony Basile, et al. v. Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. et al.**  **Timber Hill LLC v. Pershing Square Capital Management, L.P., et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated Sections 14(e), 20A, and/or 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and Rule 14e-3 promulgated thereunder. Specifically, the Action alleges that, during the Class Period from 2-25-2014 through 4-21-2014 (inclusive), the Pershing Defendants acquired or caused the acquisition of a 9.7% stake in Allegan while in possession of material nonpublic information relating to the Valeant Defendants’ contemplated takeover attempt for Allergan. On 4-21 and 22, 2014, the Valeant Defendants announced their takeover bid and the Pershing Defendants disclosed their stake. Allergan’s stock price increased about 15% in the immediate aftermath of that announcement. The Pershing Defendants’ profits from their Class Period transactions grew to well over $2 billion after a third-party, “white knight” – Actavis plc – agreed to acquire Allergan for cash and stock value at approximately $219 per Allergan share. Of this amount, the Pershing Defendants paid approximately $400 million to the Valeant Defendants pursuant to a February 2014 agreement that the Pershing Defendants would share their gains with the Valeant Defendants in the event that a competing offer for Allergan was successful, and retained the rest. | **5-30-2018** | **For more information visit:**  [**www.AllerganProxyViolationSecuritiesLitigation.com**](http://www.AllerganProxyViolationSecuritiesLitigation.com) |
| **2-6-2018** | **17-CV-02447** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Rodriguez v. Bumble Bee Foods, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges the packaging of Bumble Bee’s Premium Select Medium Red Smoked Salmon Fillets in Oil (“Medium Red Smoked Salmon”) deceptively stated or suggested the product was smoked, wild-caught salmon, when it was actually farmed salmon to which liquid smoke flavor had been added. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **Jack Fitzgeral**  **Law Office of**  **Jack Fitzagerald, P.C.**  **3636 4th Avenue**  **Suite 202**  **San Diego, CA 92103** |
| **2-9-2018** | **17-CV-00541** | **(W.D. Wash.)** | **Johnson, et al. v. MGM Holdings Inc., et al.**  This lawsuit claims that the Defendants did not properly label and market certain James Bond DVD and Blu-ray box sets. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Alexander S. Kleinberg Eisenhower Carlson PLLC**  **1201 Pacific Avenue**  **Suite 1200**  **Tacoma, WA 98402**  **253 572-4500 (Ph.)**  **253 272-5732 (Fax)** |
| **2-9-2018** | **16-CV-11797** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Mary Esposito v. American Renal Associations Holdings, Inc., et al.**  **Re Defendants: Joseph A. Carplucci, Jonathan L. Wilcox, Syed T. Kamal, Jonathan J. McDonough, Centerbridge Capital Partners L.P., Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner, & Smith, Inc., Barclays Capital Inc., Goldman, Sachs & Co., Wells Fargo Securities, LLC, SunTrust Robinson Humphrey, and Leerink Partners LLC (Defendants)**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants misled investors by issuing false and misleading public filings and statements between 4-20-2016 and 8-18-2016, inclusive (the “Settlement Class Period”), | **6-14-2018** | **For more information visit:**  [**www.arasecuritiessettlement.com**](http://www.arasecuritiessettlement.com) |
| **2-9-2018** | **13-CV-11157** | **(D. Mass.)** | **In re: AVEO Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Securities Litigation**  This is a federal securities class action on behalf of a class consisting of all persons other than defendants who purchased Aveo securities between 1-3-2012 and 5-1-2013, Case 1:13-cv-11157-JLT Document 1 Filed 05-09-13 inclusive (the “Class Period”), seeking to recover damages caused by defendants’ violations of the federal securities laws and to pursue remedies under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”). Plaintiff alleges that Defendants conditioned investors to believe that the Company’s drug Tivopath or Tivozanib, for the treatment of advanced kidney cancer, would receive approval from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) through a host of materially false and misleading statements regarding the phase 3 trial design and results. Specifically: (a) the Company failed to disclose to investors that the FDA had recommended to the Company to conduct an additional phase 3 trial due to adverse trends in the Company’s first Phase III trial; (b) the Company misled investors regarding the overall safety and efficacy of the product, compared to the control drug, sorafenib; (c) the Company failed to disclose that almost 90% of the patients studied in TIVO-1 were enrolled from sites in Central and Eastern Europe with inconsistent treatment patterns from those in the US. As a result of the foregoing, the Company’s statements were materially false and misleading at all relevant times. As a result of Defendants’ wrongful acts and omissions, and the precipitous decline in the market value of the Company’s securities, Plaintiff and other Class members have suffered significant damages. | **5-30-2018** | **For more information write to:**  **Joshua B. Silverman**  **Pomerantz LLP**  **Ten South La Salle Street**  **Suite 3505**  **Chicago, IL 60603** |
| **2-12-2018** | **15-CV-12345** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Arkansas Teacher Retirement Systems, et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by making false and misleading statements about Insulet’s business, including with respect to: the launch of its new flagship product, the Omnipod Eros insulin pump (“Eros”); the underlying demand for the Eros; and the nature and extent of alleged Eros-related manufacturing problems. Lead Plaintiffs further allege that the price of Insulet common stock was artificially inflated as a result of Defendants’ allegedly false and misleading statements, and that the price of the stock declined when the truth was gradually revealed through a series of partial disclosures in the first half of 2015. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER &**  **GROSSMANN LLP**  **James A. Harrod**  **1251 Avenue of the Americas 44th Floor**  **New York, New York 10020**  **800 380-8496 (Ph.)** |
| **2-12-2018** | **15-CV-11517** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Physician Healthsource, Inc. v. Vertex Pharmaceuticals Incorporated and Tactical Advantage Group, LLC**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 (“TCPA”), by sending unsolicited fax advertisements relating to a treatment for the hepatitis C virus titled “Incivek: A Change in the Treatment Paradigm.” Plaintiff alleges that the faxes were “unsolicited advertisements” prohibited by the TCPA. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Ross M. Good**  **Anderson + Wanca**  **3701 Algonquin Road**  **Suite 500**  **Rolling Meadows, IL 60008** |
| **2-12-2018** | **14-CV-9662** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Petrobras Securities Litigation**  Plaintiff allege that defendants violated the federal securities laws by making false and misleading statements regarding Petrobras’s financial statements, business, operational and compliance policies by concealing a bribery and kickback scheme. Among other things, the lawsuit further alleges that defendants made materially false and misleading statements throughout the Class Period about, among other things, the value of Petrobras’s assets, the amounts of Petrobras’s periodic expenses and net income, whether Petrobras suffered from material weaknesses in its disclosure controls and procedures and internal controls over financial reporting, and Petrobras’s statements that it operates with integrity. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**  [**www.petrobrassecuritieslitigation.com**](http://www.petrobrassecuritieslitigation.com) |
| **2-13-2018** | **15-CV-07081** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Levbin v. Resource Capital Corp.**  Plaintiff alleges that Resource Capital and certain of its former and current executive officers violated the federal securities laws by making false and misleading statements and/or omitting statements of material fact regarding Resource Capital’s business, including statements relating to a Mezzanine Loan that was fully impaired by the company in 2015. The Complaint alleges, among other things, that it was misleading for the Defendants to describe the Mezzanine Loan as “performing” and “current” and that the Defendants misled investors by allegedly failing to disclose that a substantial portion of the Mezzanine Loan was secured by collateral located within Puerto Rico. | **8-3-2018** | **For more information visit:**  [**www.ResourceCapitalSecuritiesLitigation.com**](http://www.ResourceCapitalSecuritiesLitigation.com) |
| **2-16-2018** | **17-CV-02282** | **(D. Nev.)** | **Park, et al. v. Zuffa LLC, et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants’ system suffered from a defect preventing purchasers of the online streaming of the Event from being able to watch some or all the Event. The five putative class action lawsuits have been consolidated into a single action pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada, titled Park, et al. v. Zuffa, LLC, d/b/a Ultimate Fighting Championship and UFC, et al., Case No. 17-cv-02282-APG-VCF (D. Nev.)  (the “Action”). In their Complaint, Plaintiffs have asserted certain claims, including those for breach of contract and for violation of applicable consumer protection laws, and sought refunds, damages and other relief from Defendants. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **Hart L. Robinovitch**  **Zimmerman Reed, LLP**  **14646 No. Kierland Blvd.**  **Suite 145**  **Scottsdale, AZ 85254** |
| **2-19-2018** | **15-CV-02393** | **(D.S.C.)** | **KBC Asset Management NV v. 3D Systems Corporation, et al.**  **Re Defendants: Abraham N. Reichental, Damon J. Gregoire, and Theodore A. Hull (collectively, the “Defendants”)**  Plaintiff alleges 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 impact of 3D Systems’ aggressive growth strategy on its operational and financial condition. Lead Plaintiff further alleges that as a result of Defendants’ false and misleading statements and omissions, 3D Systems’ stock traded at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period. | **6-25-2018** | **For more information write to:**  **ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD**  **LLP**  **ELLEN GUSIKOFF STEWART**  **655 West Broadway**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **2-20-2018** | **15-CV-00923** | **(M.D. Tenn.)** | **Kasper v. AAC Holdings, Inc., et al.**  Plaintiff alleges that certain AAC’s filings with the Security Exchange Commission between 10-2-2014 and 8-4-2015 at 9:40 a.m. (EDT) (the “Class Period”) were materially false and misleading when made, and omitted disclosing material facts necessary to statements reveal that Defendants either knew, or deliberately disregarded, facts regarding a California Department of Justice investigation concerning the death of a patient at an AAC facility, and the risks it posed to the Company’s business, prospects and operations. The Complaint further alleges that these materially false and misleading statements caused AAC securities to trade at artificially inflated prices. The Complaint alleges that as the truth about Defendants’ Class Period misstatements was revealed, it caused AAC’s stock price to decline. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write or call:**  **Donald R. Hall KAPLAN FOX &**  **KILSHEIMER LLP**  **850 Third Avenue**  **14th Floor**  **New York, NY 10022**  **212 687-1980 (Ph.)**  **Ramzi Abadou KAHN SWICK &**  **FOTI, LLC**  **206 Covington Street Madisonville, LA 70447**  **504 455-1400 (Ph.)** |
| **2-21-2018** | **16-CV-00153** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Granillo, et al. v. FCA US LLC, et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that the 9 Speed ZF 9HP automatic transmission installed in the Class Vehicles is defective because the transmission may engage in rough, delayed, or sudden shifting, emit a grinding noise during shifting, or experience a harsh engagement of gears or reduced power when the vehicle shifts into gear. Plaintiffs alleged that FCA US violated the law by selling the Class Vehicles with the defective transmission and by failing to disclose the defect to consumers. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Jordan L. Lurie**  **Tarek H. Zohdy**  **Capstone Law APC**  **1875 Century Park East**  **Suite 1000**  **Los Angeles, CA 90067**  **310 556-4811 (Ph.)**  **310 943-0396 (Fax)** |
| **2-22-2018** | **16-CV-01422** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Valeria Guerrero-Hernandez v. Ozburn-Hessey Logistics, LLC**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the California wage-and-hour laws on a class-wide basis as to all current and former hourly employees of Defendant in California who were classified as non-exempt from overtime pay. The specific claims alleged in the Action are: (1) failure to provide meal periods; (2) failure to provide rest periods; (3) failure to pay hourly wages; (4) failure to provide accurate written wage statements; (5) failure to timely pay all final wages; (6) unfair competition; and (7) civil penalties based on these alleged violations. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call fax or e-mail:**  **Setareh Law Group**  **Shaun Setareh**  **Thomas Segal**  **9454 Wilshire Blvd.**  **Suite 907**  **Beverly Hills, CA 90212**  **310 888-7771 (Ph.)**  **310 888-0109 (Fax)**  [**shaun@setarehlaw.com**](mailto:shaun@setarehlaw.com)  [**thomas@setarehlaw.com**](mailto:thomas@setarehlaw.com) |
| **2-22-2018** | **15-MD-02626** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Alcon Laboratories, Inc. (“Alcon”) (a division of Novartis AG (“Novartis”); Johnson & Johnson Vision Care, Inc. (“JJVC”) (which operates in the US under the “Vistakon” trade name); Bausch & Lomb Inc. (“B&L”) (owned by Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. (“Valeant”)); and CooperVision, Inc. (“CV”) (collectively “Manufacturer Defendants”)**  Plaintiffs assert that the Manufacturer Defendants conspired with each other and with Defendant ABB Concise Optical Group, KLKC (“ABB”), a wholesaler, as well as independent eye care professionals (“ECPs”) (e.g., optometrists and ophthalmologists who sell contact lenses to consumers) and their trade association, the American Optometric Association (“AOA”), to impose minimum resale prices on certain contact lens lines by subjecting them to “Unilateral Pricing Policies (“UPPs”), thereby reducing or eliminating price competition on those products from “big box” stores (e.g., those owned or operated by Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (“Wal-Mart”) and Meijer, Inc. (“Meijer”)), buying clubs (e.g., those run by Costco Wholesale Corporation (“Costco”)) and internet-based retailers (e.g., 1-800-Contacts and LensDiscounters.com) (collectively, “Discount Retailers”) by preventing them from discounting those products. As ECPs themselves have acknowledged, this new pricing scheme represents a fundamental shift” in how contact lenses are sold to consumers. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Robert C. Gilbert**  **Koplowitz Ostrow Ferguson**  **Weiselberg Gilbert**  **2525 Poncer de Leon Blvd.**  **Suite 625**  **Coral Gables, FL 33134**  **305 384-7270 (Ph.)**  **954 525-4300 (Fax)** |
| **2-22-2018** | **16-CV-01478** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Jim Youngman and Robert Allen, v. A&B Insurance and Financial, Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that on 8-18-2012 and 4-26-2017, A&B Insurance 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, or by placing more than one call within any twelve-month period to a telephone number registered on the Do Not Call Registry for at least 31 days. The class representatives claim that A&B Insurance did not have the recipients’ permission to make these calls. | **8-30-2018** | **For more information write, visit or call:**  **Edward Broderick Anthony Paronich**  **Broderick & Paronich, P.C.,**  **727 Atlantic Avenue**  **Second Floor**  **Boston, MA, 02111**  [**www.ABTCPASettlement.com**](http://www.abtcpasettlement.com/)  **617 738-7080 (Ph.)** |
| **2-22-2018** | **14-CV-13475** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Vladimir Chebotnikov, et al. v. LimoLink Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that LimoLink had violated the Massachusetts Tips Law, Mass.Gen.Laws ch. 149, § 152A, because all gratuities paid by LimoLink customers should have been paid to the drivers. LimoLink acknowledges that prior to 12-2014 it charged its customers a gratuity – typically 20% of the amount charged to the customer – that it then retained as part of its general revenue stream. The gratuity LimoLink paid to its vendors was separately determined, typically 20% of the base rate it paid the vendor and often less than the amount charged to the customers. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, e-mail or call:**  **Hillary Schwab**  **Rachel Smit**  **Fair Work, P.C.**  **192 South Street**  **Suite 450**  **Boston, MA 02111**  [**hillary@fairworklaw.com**](mailto:hillary@fairworklaw.com)  [**rachel@fairworklaw.com**](mailto:rachel@fairworklaw.com)  **617 841-8188 (Ph.)** |
| **2-22-2018** | **16-CV-01661** | **(W.D. Wash.)** | **David Hanson v. MGM Resorts International, et al.**  **Re Defendant: Costco Wholesale Corporation**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants MGM Resorts International and Costco Wholesale Corporation charged customers’ monthly inactivity fees in violation of the federal Electronic Funds Transfer Act and other state laws. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call Class Counsel:**  **1 866 354-3015 (Ph.)** |
| **2-23-2018** | **17-CV-00677** | **(W.D. Wash.)** | **Bowen, et al. v. CSO Financial, Inc., et al.**  **Re Defendants: CSO Financial, Inc., a/k/a Credit Services of Oregon, J. Michael Unfred, d/b/a J. Michael Unfred LLC, and Does One Through Ten**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the law by attempting to collect debts related to dishonored checks by sending notices that did not comply with the FDCPA and the Washington CPA and demanding fees that they were not permitted by law to collect. Plaintiffs claim that, between 2-9-2013 and 9-1-2015 and/or 2-9-2016 and 9-27-2016, one or more Defendants 1) collected charges that were not due; 2) were not licensed as a collection agency under Washington law; 3) sent notices of dishonored check to class members that did not comply with Washington law; and 4) failed to send effective validation notices to class members. Plaintiffs also allege that by this conduct Defendants violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, the Washington Consumer Protection Act, and the Washington Collection Agency Act. | **7-10-2018** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **Terrell Marshall Law**  **Group PLLC**  **936 N 34th**  **Suite #300**  **Seattle, WA 98103**  **Law Office of Paul Arons**  **685 Spring Street**  **#104**  **Friday Harbor, WA 98250** |
| **2-23-2018** | **15-CV-05742** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Daniel Garza v. Brinderson Constructors, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that Brinderson allegedly violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act, the California Investigative Consumer Reporting Agencies Act, and the California Consumer Credit Report Agencies Act by allegedly failing to obtain proper authorization to obtain consumer reports on employees and potential employees. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Shaun Setareh**  **Thomas Segal**  **SETAREH LAW GROUP**  **9454 Wilshire Blvd.**  **Suite 9007**  **Beverly Hills, CA 90212**    **310 888-7771 (Ph.)**  **310 888-0109 (Fax)** |
| **2-23-2018** | **17-CV-3809** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Sanders, et al. v. The CJS Solutions Group, LLC d/b/a The HCI Group**  Plaintiffs allege that, individuals who performed consulting work for HCI between 5-19-2014 through on or about 5-31-2017 were not paid overtime compensation to which they were entitled under the law. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Shanon J. Carson**  **Sarah R. Schalman-Bergen**  **Alexandra K. Piazza**  **BERGER & MONTAGUE, P.C.**  **1622 Locust Street Philadelphia, PA 19103** |
| **2-23-2018** | **7-CV-5944** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendant: Mitsubishi Electric Corporation**  Plaintiff alleges that that Mitsubishi Electric Corporation conspired with other manufacturers of CRTs to fix the prices of CRTs from 3-1-1995 to 11-25-2007, which resulted in overcharges to people and businesses that bought CRT Products, such as televisions and computer monitors. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit or call:**  [**www.CRTclaims.com**](http://www.CRTclaims.com)  **1 800 649-0963 (Ph.)** |
| **2-23-2018** | **12-MD-02311**  **13-CV-01003**  **13-CV-02403**  **13-CV-02703** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **In re: Radiators**  **In re: Automatic Transmission Fluid Warmers**  **In re: Air Conditioning Systems (End Payor Plaintiffs)**  **Re Defendants: Calsonic Kansei Corporation and CalsonicKansei North America, Inc.**  End-Payor Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of Calsonic’s participation in unlawful conspiracies to raise, fix maintain, and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for (1) Radiators (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’ Second Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint (Case No. 2:13-cv-01003, Doc. No. 186)(Radiators Complaint”), (2) ATF Warmers and Oil Coolers (as defined below) in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act and various state antitrust, unfair completion, unjust enrichment, and consumer protection laws as set forth in End-Payor Plaintiffs’ Second Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint (Case No. 2:130CV-02403, Doc. No. 108) (“ATF Warmers Complaint”), and (3) Air Conditioning Systems (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’ Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint (Case No. 2:13-CV-02702, Doc. No. 105)(“Air Conditioning Systems Complaint”). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Cotchett, Pitre, & McCrthy**  **LLP**  **San Francisco Airport Office Center 840 Malcolm Road**  **Suite 200**  **Burlingame, CA 94010** |
| **2-28-2018** | **17-CV-00253** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **Edwin Dean Epps, Olivia C. Torres, and Richard (Rick Jones) G. Jones, Jr. v. OrangeLake Country Club, Inc. d/b/a Orange Lake Resort and Country Club**  **Re Defendants: Orange Lake Resorts, and OLCC Virginia, LLC and Orange Lake Holdings, LLP d/b/a Orange Lake Resorts v. Sterling Infosystems, Inc. d/b/a SterlingBackcheck (collectively the “Defendants”)**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq. (the “FCRA”) by using a consent form to obtain consumer reports about them that required them to agree, as a condition of employment, that Defendants do not engage in discrimination, and required applicants to notify Defendants within five days of a challenge to the accuracy of the report. | **6-20-2018** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **Leonard A. Bennett**  **CONSUMER LITIGATION**  **ASSOCIATES, P.C.**  **763 J. Clyde Morris Blvd. Suite 1-A**  **Newport News, VA 23601** |
| **2-28-2018** | **12-CV-0203**  **12-CV-2311** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re Auto Parts Antitrust Litigation (Instrument Panel Clusters)**  **Re Defendants: Continental Automotive Systems, Inc., Continental Automotive Electronics, LLC, and Continental Automotive Korea, Ltd. (collectively, the “Continental Defendants”)**  Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of Continental’s participation in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for Instrument Panel Clusters 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 in the Instrument Panel Clusters Action. | **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** |
| **1-4-2018**  **Late arrival** | **15-CV-05457** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Daniel Gordon, et al. v. Amdeus IT Group, S.A., et al.**  **Re Defendants: Travelport Worldwide Limited and Travelport LP**  Plaintiffs allege that these companies operate as “global distribution systems,” or GDSs, which are businesses that function as intermediaries between airlines and travel agents. Plaintiffs allege that these GDSs conspired unlawfully to impose certain contract provisions on several airlines, and that those provisions resulted in higher airfares for the plaintiffs and Class Members.  Among other allegations, plaintiffs claimed each defendant required airlines to make their ticket information available only through that defendant’s platform. Defendants also required airlines to refrain from imposing a surcharge for booking through a GDS or from offering tickets through non-GDS channels, the plaintiffs claim. | **4-23-2018** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **Vicent J. Esades**  **Heins Mills & Olson, P.L.C.**  **310 Clifton Avenue**  **Minneapolis, MN 55403** |