| **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **11-1-2017** | **15-CV-01936** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Kissel v. Code42 Software Inc., et al.**  Plaintiff alleges that Code42 failed to present its automatic renewal offer terms and/or continuous service offer terms “clearly and conspicuously” and in “visual proximity” “to the request for consent to the offer” in violation of California’s Business & Professions Code § 17602(a)(1). Plaintiff similarly alleges Code42 failed to obtain Plaintiff’s and the Class’s affirmative consent before the subscription was fulfilled in violation of Business & Professions Code §§ 17602(a)(1) and 17603, and failed to provide an acknowledgment with the automatic renewal offer terms and information regarding Defendant’s cancellation policy in violation of Business & Professions Code §§ 17602(a)(3) and 17602(b)(2). | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write or call:**  **Scott Ferrell**  **Pacific Trial Attorneys**  **4100 Newport Place Dr. Suite 800**  **Newport Beach, CA 92260**  **1 949 706-6464 (Ph.)** |
| **11-1-2017** | **17-CV-005427** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Lauren Byrne v. Santa Barbara Hospitality Services, Inc., et al.**  Plaintiff alleges that they were treated as employees rather than as owners (i.e., members of limited liability companies), and as a result were entitled to but did not receive adequate compensation and benefits in exchange for the services they provided to the Club(s). Plaintiff further contend that Defendants failed to pay overtime, failed to provide meal and rest periods, failed to provide accurate, itemized wage statements, that Defendants were engaged in unlawful tip sharing arrangements with the entertainers and that Defendants violated the Private Attorney General Act (Cal. Labor Code §§ 2699, et seq.). | **Not set yet**  Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more information write to:**  **Todd Slobin**  **Ricardo J. Prieto**  **Shellist | Lazaarz |**  **Slobin LLP**  **11 Greenway Plaza**  **Suite 1515**  **Houston, TX 77046** |
| **11-1-2017** | **16-CV-00268** | **(W.D. WA.)** | **Nugussie, et al. v. HMSHost North America, et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendant was required to pay a minimum wage of $15 per hour in 2014 and of $15.24 in 2015 and part of 2016 to members of the Settlement Class, but that it failed to do so. | **2-22-2018** | **For more informastion write, call or fax:**  **Badgley Mullins Turner**  **Duncan C. Turner**  **19929 Ballinger Way NE**  **Suite 200**  **Seattle, WA 98155**  **206 612-6566 (Ph.)**  **206 621-9896 (Fax)** |
| **11-3-2017** | **16-CV-04524** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Lynch, et al. v. Motorola Mobility LLC d/b/a Motorola and Lenovo**  Plaintiffs allege that Motorola failed to provide warranty service consistent with its warranty obligations and are liable for breach of warranty, unjust enrichment, and violation of the state consumer protection laws of Arizona, Florida, Georgia, and Texas. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Kenneth A. Wexler**  **Mark R. Miller**  **Adam Prom**  **WEXLER WALLACE LLP**  **55 W. Monroe Street**  **Suite 3300**  **Chicago, Illinois 60603** |
| **11-3-2017** | **10-CV-02179** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Moyle, et al. v. Liberty Mutual Retirement Benefits Plan, et al.**  **Re Defendants: Liberty Mutual Retirement Benefit Plan (the “Retirement Plan”), Liberty Mutual Retirement Plan Retirement Board, Liberty Mutual Group Inc., and Liberty, Mutual Insurance Company (collectively, “Defendants”)**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants breached their fiduciary duties to the Class Representatives, and to all others similarly situated (that is, all the Class Members), by allegedly misrepresenting the terms under which former Golden Eagle Insurance Company employees would receive retirement benefits under the Retirement Plan. Specifically, the Class Representatives allege Defendants led them – as well as the Class Members – to believe that, if they accepted employment with Liberty Mutual, their monthly retirement benefit under the Plan would be calculated using their years of service with Golden Eagle Insurance Company in addition to their years of service with Liberty Mutual when they retire. The Class Representatives allege that, because of this alleged breach of fiduciary duty under Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, Defendants are required to pay the Class Representatives and the Class Members retirement benefits utilizing each Class Member’s years of service with Golden Eagle Insurance Company, even though the Plan itself provides otherwise. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Craig McKenzie Nicholas**  **Nicholas and Tomasevic LLP**  **225 Broadway, 19th Floor**  **San Diego, CA 92101**  **619 325-0492 (Ph.)**  **619 325-0496 (Fax)**  [**cnicholas@nicholaslaw.org**](mailto:cnicholas@nicholaslaw.org) |
| **11-3-2017** | **12-MD-02311**  **16-CV-03702**  **16-CV-03703** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **In re: Exhaust Systems**  **In re: Exhaust Systems**  **Re Defendants: Eberspächer Exhaust Technology GmbH & Co. KG and Eberspächer North America Inc. (together, “Eberspächer”)**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants and co-conspirators, manufacturers and/or suppliers of Exhaust Systems globally and in the United States, engaged in a long running conspiracy to unlawfully fix, artificially rise, maintain and/or stabilize prices, rig bids for, and allocate the market and customers in the United States for Exhaust Systems. According to the United States Department of Justice Defendants’ conspiracy successfully targeted the long-struggling United States automotive industry, raising prices for car manufacturers and consumers alike. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Barrett Law Group, P.A.**  **P.O. Box 927**  **404 Court Square**  **Lexington, MS 39095** |
| **11-6-2017** | **16-CV-09381** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Marett v. Palm Restaurant, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendant, Palm Restaurant, Inc., violated the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) and New York State and local laws in designing and maintaining its website, Palm.com (the “Website”), such that blind visitors could not acquire the same information and engage in the same interactions as sighted visitors to the Website. | **2-26-2018** | **For more information write to:**  **C.K. Lee**  **Lee Litigation Group, PLLC**  **30 East 39th Street**  **Second Floor**  **New York, NY 10016** |
| **11-7-2017** | **15-CV-04198** | **(N.D. Ga.)** | **Sharon Crosby v. Core-Mark Distributors, Inc.**  Supplemental Notice is being issued to update paragraph 7 (**28 U.S.C. § 1715(b) (7) (A)-(B) – Names of Class Members/Estimate of Class Members**) in the original Notice dated 9-8-2017. For more information see CAFA Notice dated 9-8-2017. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **James A Francis**  **Francis & Mailman, P.C.**  **Land Title Building**  **Suite 1902**  **100 South Broad Street**  **Philadelphia, PA 19110**  **215 735-6000 (Ph.)** |
| **11-8-2017** | **14-CV-06446** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Juan Castro, Jr., v. Sovran Self Storage, Inc. t/a Uncle Bob’s Self Storage, Sovran Acquisition LP and Uncle Bob’s Management LLC**  Plaintiff alleges that the Rental Agreement, the Insurance Form, and the Notice to Vacate include provisions that violate the New Jersey Truth in Consumer Contract Warranty and Notice Act, N.J.S.A. 56:12-14, et seq. (“TCCWNA) and the New Jersey Consumer Fraud Act, N.J.S.A. 56:8-1 et seq. (“CFA”). Plaintiff also asserted (i) that Sovran violated the TCCWNA and the CFA by allegedly engaging in the unlicensed sale of insurance; (ii) that Sovran violated the CFA by allegedly failing to provide a copy of the insurance certificate to Plaintiff; (3) that Defendants violated the CFA because the insurance program allegedly was “phantom coverage” that did not cover mold and mildew-related property losses Plaintiff suffered during the lease; and (4) that Defendants violated the CFA by allegedly charging “inflated” or “unconscionable high” premiums for the property damage insurance. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Michael A. Galpern**  **Andrew P. Bell**  **Charles N. Riley**  **James A. Barry**  **The Locks Law Firm, LLC**  **801 N. Kings Highway**  **Cherry Hill, NJ 08034**  **866 298-9934 (Ph.)** |
| **11-9-2017** | **16-CV-00492** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Farrell v. Bank of America, N.A.**  The lawsuit claims that the extended overdrawn balance charges (EOBCs) assessed in connection with consumer checking accounts violate the National Bank Act’s usury limit. | **6-18-2018** | **For more information write to:**  **Jeffrey D. Kaliel**  **Tycko & Zavareei LLP**  **1828 L Street, NW**  **Suite 1000**  **Washington, DC 20036** |
| **11-9-2017** | **16-CV-05486** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Abante Rooter and Plumbing, Inc., et al. v. Pivotal Payments, Inc. dba Capital Processing Network and CPN**  Plaintiff alleges that Pivotal violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) when Gordon Rose and/or EPLJ Enterprises, LLC made telemarketing calls to cell phones through the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice. The class representative claims that Pivotal did not have the recipients’ permission to make these calls. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Beth E. Terrell**  **Jennifer Rust Murray**  **Terrell Marshall Law Group**  **936 N. 34th Street**  **Suite 300**  **Seattle, WA 98103** |
| **11-10-2017** | **15-CV-1973** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Dodge, et al. v. PHH Corporation, et al.**  **Re Defendants: Realogy Holdings Corp., Realogy Group LLC, Realogy Intermediate Holdings LLC, Title Resource Group LLC, West Coast Escrow Company, Equity Title Company, TRG Services Escrow, Inc., NRT LLC, Realogy Services Group LLC, and Realogy Services Venture Partner LLC (together, “the Realogy Defendants”)**  Plaintiffs allege that borrowers who closed on a mortgage loan with the PHH Defendants or the  PHH Home Loans Defendants during the Class Period were improperly referred for title, escrow, and closing-related services to Title Resource Group LLC or its affiliates (who are among the Realogy Defendants) in exchange for certain things of value and that this practice violated the federal Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act, 12 U.S.C. § 2607, et seq. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Daniel S. Robinson**  **Wesley K. Polischuk**  **Robinson Calcagnie, Inc.**  **19 Corporate Plaza Drive**  **Newport Beach, CA 92660**  **949 720-1288 (Ph.)**  **949 720-1292 (Fax)** |
| **11-10-2017** | **16-CV-01668** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: 24 Hour Fitness Prepaid Membership Litigation**  Plaintiffs allege that 24 Hour Fitness carried out a fraudulent and misleading sales campaign related to prepaid memberships, by orally promising consumers a fixed annual renewal amount, and then years later raising these renewal amounts. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Timothy N. Mathews**  **Catherine Pratsinakis**  **CHIMICLES& TIKELLIS LLP**  **One Haverford Centre**  **361 West Lancaster Avenue**  **Haverford, PA 19041**  **610 642-8500 (Ph.)**  **610 649-3633 (Fax)** |
| **11-10-2017** | **11-CV-05843** | **(W.D. Wash.)** | **Slack, et al. v. Swift Transportation Co.**  Plaintiffs alleged, among other things, that (i) Swift paid the Class drivers by the mile and failed to pay overtime, or the reasonable equivalent of overtime, as required by Washington State law for all hours worked over forty hours in a week; (ii) Swift failed to pay some Class members who attended Swift orientation in Washington State for attendance at the orientation; and (iii) Swift unlawfully deducted and withheld portions of the mileage pay for Class members who participated in the Swift per diem plan. | **1-29-2018** | **For more information write to:**  **HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP**  **1918 Eighth Avenue**  **Suite 3300**  **Seattle, WA 98101** |
| **11-13-2017** | **14-CV-1718**  **15-CV-323** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Saju Varghese v. JP Morgan Chase & Co., et al.**  **LeRoy Taylor, III, Agnes Lambert, et al. v. JP Morgan Chase & Co., et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that Assistant Branch Managers (“ABMs”) frequently worked more than 40 hours per week but that Defendants failed to pay overtime compensation for each hour worked in excess of 40 because defendants misclassified ABMs as exempt from the requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act and corresponding state laws. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Gregg I. Shavitz**  **Alan Quiles**  **Shavitz Law Group, P.A.**  **1515 S. Federal Highway**  **Suite 404**  **Baca Raton, FL 33432** |
| **11-13-2017** | **12-CV-2548** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: J.P. Morgan Stable Value Fund ERISA Litigation**  **Re Defendants: J.P. Morgan Chase & Co., JPMorgan Chase Bank N.A., and J.P. Morgan Investment Management Inc. (“Defendants” or JPMorgan”)**  Plaintiffs allege that JPMorgan managed Plaintiffs’ investments imprudently in violation of JPMorgan’s fiduciary duties, by causing its stable value funds to invest heavily in two other JPMorgan funds, the Intermediate Bond Fund (“IBF”) and the  Intermediate Public Bond Fund (“IPBF”), which, in turn, invested in risky, highly leveraged assets, including, among other things, mortgage-related assets. Second, Plaintiffs allege that certain Defendants, as fiduciaries for the relevant plans and their participants and beneficiaries, breached their obligations under ERISA to comply with the duties of prudence and diversification and to discharge their duties solely in the interests of plan participants and beneficiaries, and for the exclusive purpose of providing benefits to the plan participants and beneficiaries. Plaintiffs also claim that certain Defendants engaged in transactions prohibited by ERISA, and the ACSAF/JPM Stable Value Fund Subclass Plaintiffs make additional claims against all Defendants for engaging in transactions prohibited by ERISA. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write, email or call:**  **Schneider Wallace Cottrell**  **Konecky Wotkyns LLP**  **Attn: JPM Stable Value Fund**  **ERISA Litigation**  **2000 Powell Street**  **Suite 1400**  **Emeryville, CA 94608**  [**counsel@jpmsvfclassaction.com**](mailto:counsel@jpmsvfclassaction.com)  **1-844-877-5925 (Ph.)** |
| **11-14-2017** | **16-CV-03861** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Barnard v. CorePower Yoga, LLP**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendant: (a) failed to pay yoga instructors for all time worked (including minimum and overtime wages); (b) did not provide yoga instructors with complete meal periods and rest breaks; (c) failed to reimburse yoga instructors for business-related expenses; (d) failed to issue yoga instructors proper itemized wage statements and comply with related paid sick leave obligations; and (e) did not pay terminated or resigning yoga instructors all of their final wages in a timely manner. | **2-15-2018** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **David C. Hawkes**  **Blanchard, Krasner & French**  **800 Silverado Street**  **2nd Floor**  **LaJolla, CA 92037**  **858 551-2440 (Ph.)**  **858 551-2334 (Fax)** |
| **11-14-2017** | **16-CV-10671** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Hayes v. Citizens Financial Group, Inc. et al.**  **Supplemental Notice:** In accordance with Section 1715(b)(7), attached as (i) Exhibit 1 is a list of the names of the class members who reside in each State; and (ii) Exhibit 2 is list of the estimated, aggregated proportional share of the claims of such members to the entire Settlement per State. For more information see CAFA Notice Dated 10-6-2017. | **2-22-2018** | **For more information visit or call:**  [**www.citizensbankannualfeeclassactionsettlement.com**](http://www.citizensbankannualfeeclassactionsettlement.com)  **1 844 402-8591 (Ph.)** |
| **11-15-2017** | **15-CV-007895** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **J.V., et al. v. Pomona Unified School District, et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that Pomona Unified School District (“PUSD”) violated the American with Disabilities Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Unruh Civil Rights Act, the California Education Code, as well as other claims and the developmentally disabled student suffered injury as a result. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **Christine A. Scheuneman**  **Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw**  **Pittmn LLP**  **725 S. Figueroa Street**  **Suite 2800**  **Los Angeles, CA 90017**  **213 488-7100 (Ph.)** |
| **11-15-2017** | **16-CV-60364** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Ashley Moody and Autumn Terrell, et al. v. Ascenda USA Inc. d/b/a 24-7 Intouch, and Verified Credentials, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act by reporting certain public record information in certain consumer reports without first providing notice to consumers or without having procedures to ensure that the reported information was complete and up to date. Based on these allegations, Plaintiff sought statutory damages. | **3-9-2018** | **For more information write or call:**  **Luis A. Cabassa**  **Brandon J. Hill**  **Wenzel Fenton Cabassa,P.A.**  **1110 North Florida Avenue**  **Suite 300**  **Tapa, Florida 33602**  **813 224-0431 (Ph.)** |
| **11-16-2017** | **16-CV-01452** | **`**  **(D.N.J.)** | **Cannon, et al. v. Ashburn Corporation, Wines**  **‘Til Sold Out (“WTSO”)**  Plaintiffs allege that because certain wines were not sold anywhere at the purported “Original Price,” the discount advertised by WTSO was not real, and consumers were not buying wines at a discount. The Plaintiffs further allege that WTSO offered wines that were available elsewhere but that the stated “Original Price” of some of these wines was higher than the price set by the winery itself, resulting in a greater advertised discount than would have existed had Defendant used the winery’s price for such wines. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Oren Giskan**  **GISKAN SOLOTAROFF & ANDERSON**  **LLP**  **217 Centre Street**  **6th Floor**  **New York, NY 10013** |
| **11-16-2017** | **16-CV-01478** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Jim Youngman and Robert Allen v. A&B Insurance and Financial, Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that 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 to telephone numbers that were listed on the National Do-Not-Call Registry. The class representatives claim that A&B Insurance did not have the recipients’ permission to make these calls. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **Edward Broderick**  **Anthony Paronich**  **BRODERICK & PARONICH, P.C.**  **99 High St., Suite 304**  **Boston, Massachusetts 02110** |
| **11-16-2017** | **15-CV-11038** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Fulton Dental, LLC v. Bisco, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendant sent unsolicited fax advertisement promoting its goods or services that did not contain a proper opt out notice. Plaintiff alleged that these faxes violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. | **3-7-2018** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **Alexander H. Burke**  **Daniel J. Marovitch**  **BURKE LAW OFFICES, LLC**  **155 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 9020**  **Chicago, Illinois 60601**  **312 729‐5288 (Ph.)**  **312 729‐5289 (Fax)** |
| **11-16-2017** | **14-CV-00737** | **(S.D. Ind.)** | **Simms v. ExtraTarget, LLC**  Plaintiff seeks to hold ExtraTarget (“Defendant”) liable under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act for text messages sent by or on behalf of Simply Fashion to consumers allegedly without their prior express consent either because the consumers never asked to receive the Simply Fashion text messages, or because they continued receiving the Simply Fashion text messages after asking for them to stop. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Ronald A. Marron**  **Alexis M. Wood**  **Kas L. Gallucci**  **Law Offices of**  **Ronald A. Marron**  **651 Arroyo Drive**  **San Diego, CA 92103**  **619 696-9006 (Ph.)** |
| **11-17-2017** | **11-MD-2262** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: U.S. Dollar Labor-Based Instrument**  Plaintiffs claim that Barclays 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. 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 Barclays and the Non-Settling Defendants. | **1-23-2018** | **For more information write, call or visit:**  **William C. Carmody**  **Susman Godfrey LLP**  **1301 Avenue of the Americas**  **32nd Floor**  **New York, NY 10019**  **1 888 568-7640 (Ph.)**  [**www.usdollarliborsettlement.com**](http://www.usdollarliborsettlement.com) |
| **11-17-2017** | **14-CV-02422** | **(E.D. Cal.)** | **Story v. Mammoth Mountain Ski Area, LLC**  Plaintiff claims that Defendant violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47  U.S.C. § 227, by making prerecorded- or artificial-voice telephone calls to consumers without proper consent. | **3-13-2018** | **For more information write, call or fax:**  **GLANCY PRONGAY & MURRAY LLP**  **Mark S. Greenstone**  **1925 Century Park East**  **Suite 2100**  **Los Angeles, CA 90067**  **310 201-9150 (Ph.)**  **310 201-9160 (Fax)** |
| **11-17-2018** | **17-CV-11637**  **12-MD-02311** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **Ascher, et al. v. Kiekert AG et al.**  **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation, MDL**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants Kiekert AG  and Kiekert U.S.A., Inc. (together, “Kiekert Defendants”) and unnamed co-conspirators, manufacturers, and/or suppliers of Side-Door Latches and Latch Minimodules 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 Side-Door Latches and Latch Minimodules. According to the United States Department of Justice. The conspiracy successfully targeted the long struggling United States automotive industry, raising prices for car manufacturers and consumers alike. | **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 LL**  **399 Park Avenue**  **Suite 3600**  **New York, NY 10022** |
| **11-20-2017** | **17-CV-13005**  **12-MD-02311** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **Landers Auto Group No. 1, Inc., et al. v. Kiekert AG, et al.**  **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of Kiekert’s participation in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for Side-Door Latches and Latch Minimodules in various state antitrust, unfair competition, unjust enrichment, and consumer protection laws as set forth in Automobile Dealership Plaintiffs’ Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint (Case No. 2:17-cv-11637). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **BARRETT LAW GROUP, P.A.**  **P.O. Box 927**  **404 Court Square**  **Lexington, MS 39095**  **CUNEO GILBERT & LaDUCA, LLP**  **Suite 200**  **4725 Wisconsin Avenue, NW**  **Washington, DC 20016** |
| **11-21-2017** | **15-CV-792** | **(S.D. Ohio)** | **Palombaro, et al. v. Emery Federal Credit Union**  Plaintiffs allege that between 1-1-2009 and 12-31-2014, Genuine Title provided certain unlawful benefits to Emery’s employees and/or agents in exchange for their agreement to refer borrowers to Genuine Title for the settlement of their Emery residential mortgage loans. | **Not set yet** | **For more informnation write or e-mail:**  **Michael Paul Smith**  **Smith, Gildea &**  **Schmidt, LLC**  **600 Washington Avenue**  **Suite 200**  **Towson, MD 21204**  [**mpsmith@sgs-law.com**](mailto:mpsmith@sgs-law.com) |
| **11-21-2017** | **12-MD-02311**  **15-CV-03303** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **In re: Shock Absorbers (End-Payor Action)**  **Re Defendants: Hitachi Automotive Systems, Ltd. and Hitachi Automotive Systems Americas, Inc. (collectively, “HIAMS Defendants”)**  Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of HIAMS's participation in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for Shock Absorbers in violation of Section I of the Sherman Act and various state antitrust, unfair competition, unjust enrichment, and consumer protection laws as set forth in End-Payor Plaintiffs' Amended Class Action Complaint. | **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** |
| **11-22-2017** | **10-CV-06317** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Korrow v. Aaron’s, Inc. et al.**  This lawsuit is about whether New Jersey laws forbid Aaron’s from charging two disputed fees in its rent-to-own contracts. These fees have been referred to in Aaron’s contracts as: a “Service Plans” fee and a “Return Check” fee charged when a customer’s check is returned “for any reason.” These two charges are referred to in this Notice as the “disputed fees.” | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Andrew R. Wolf**  **Henry P. Wolfe**  **The Wolf Law Firm, LLC**  **1520 U.S.Highway 130**  **Suite 101**  **North Brunswick, NJ 08902** |
| **11-22-2017** | **12-MD-02311**  **13-CV-01402** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**  **In re: Ignition Coils**  **Re Defendants: Diamond Electric Mfg. Co., Ltd. and Diamond Electric Mfg. Corporation (together “Diamond Electric”)**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants and unnamed co-conspirators, manufacturers and/or suppliers of Ignition Coils 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 Ignition Coils. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **Barrett Law Group, P.A.**  **P.O. Box 927**  **404 Court Square**  **Lexington, MS 39095** |
| **11-22-2017** | **14-CV-03007** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Brinker, et al. v. Normandin’s, et al.**  **Re Defendants: OneCommand, Inc. (collectively referred to herein as “Defendants”)**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act by making prerecorded telemarketing calls to Class Members. The Class Representatives claim that Defendants did not have Class Members’ permission to make these calls. | **3-29-2018** | **For more information write or e-mail:**  **Beth E. Terrell**  **Terrell Marshall Law Group**  **PLLC**  **936 North 34th Street, Suite**  **Seattle, Wash. 98103-8869**  [**bterrell@tmdwlaw.com**](mailto:bterrell@tmdwlaw.com) |
| **11-27-2017** | **13-MD-02420** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litigation (Direct Purchaser Action)**  **Re Defendant: Samsung SDI Co. Ltd. and Samsung SDI America, Inc. (together “SDI”)**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants and co-conspirators conspired to raise and fix the prices of Li-Ion Cells for over ten years, resulting in overcharges to direct purchasers of Li-Ion Cells, Li-Ion Batteries and Li-Ion Products. The complaint describes how the Defendants and co-conspirators allegedly violated the U.S. antitrust laws by agreeing to fix prices and restrict output of Li-Ion Cells in face-to-face meetings and other communications, customer allocation, and the use of trade associations. | **5-8-2018** | **For more information call or visit:**  **1 844 778-5952 (Ph.)**  [**www.BatteriesDirectPurchaserAntitrustSettlement.com**](http://www.BatteriesDirectPurchaserAntitrustSettlement.com) |
| **11-27-2017** | **15-CV-00910** | **(W.D. Pa.)** | **Richard P. Marburger, Trustee of the Olive MJ. Marburger Living Trust et al. v. XTO Energy Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that XTO must pay royalties on the gross proceeds of sale, whether the gas is sold at the wells or downstream of the wells, without any netting of post-production costs. The Phillips Standard Leases do not expressly require payment of royalties on gross proceeds but they also do not expressly permit XTO to net out post-production costs. | **3-27-2018** | **For more information write or call:**  **David A. Borkovic**  **Jones, Gregg, Creehan**  **& Gerace, LLP**  **411 Seventh Avenue**  **Suite 1200**  **Pittsburgh, PA 15219**  **412 261-6400 (Ph.)** |
| **11-29-2017** | **13-MD-02420** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litigation (Direct Purchaser Action)**  **Re Defendant: TOKIN Corporation (TOKIN), formerly known as NEC TOKIN Corporation.**  **For more information see CAFA Notice above dated 11-27-2017.** | **5-8-2018** | **For more information call or visit:**  **1 844 778-5952 (Ph.)**  [**www.BatteriesDirectPurchaserAntitrustSettlement.com**](http://www.BatteriesDirectPurchaserAntitrustSettlement.com) |
| **11-29-2017** | **16-CV-009245** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Harry and Glory Jones, et al. v. Cenlar, FSB, et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that when a borrower was required to have insurance for his or her property pursuant to a residential mortgage or home equity loan or line of credit, and evidence of acceptable coverage was not provided (for example, when the insurance policy did not exist or had lapsed), Cenlar would place insurance in a manner such that Cenlar allegedly received an unauthorized benefit. Plaintiffs allege further that Cenlar did so primarily to receive “kickbacks” from the Assurant Defendants or other insurance providers. Plaintiffs also allege that the way in which LPI Policies were obtained and placed caused the rates and premiums to be excessive. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write or visit:**  **Adam M. Moskowitz**  **Kozyak, Tropin, & Throckmorton, LLP**  **2525 Ponce de Leon Blvd., 9th Floor**  **Coral Gables, FL 33134**  [**www.JonesSettlementInfo.com**](http://www.JonesSettlementInfo.com) |
| **11-29-2017** | **16-CV-3492** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Robert Springer, et al. v. Code Rebel Corporation, et al.**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated certain federal securities laws by making misrepresentations or omissions of material fact concerning Code Rebel’s financial statements and condition. The First Amended Complaint alleges that the misstatements or omissions artificially inflated the price of Code Rebel securities, and that the securities prices dropped in response to certain subsequent disclosures. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Laurence Rosen**  **Phillip Kim**  **THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.**  **275 Madison Avenue**  **34th Floor**  **New York, New York 10016**  **Jeremy A. Lieberman**  **Joseph A. Hood, II**  **Justin S. Nematzadeh**  **POMERANTZ LLP**  **600 Third Avenue**  **20th Floor**  **New York, NY 10016** |
| **11-30-2017** | **15-CV-05569** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **West, et al. v. Act II Jewelry, LLC and Victor K. Kiam, III**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendant Act II Jewelry, LLC f/k/a lia sophia (“Act II”) breached its promise to its customers to provide a lifetime warranty for the jewelry sold by its sales advisors. The lawsuit further alleges that Act II harmed its sales advisors by misappropriating their customer information, and making misstatement to those sales advisors concerning the closing of its business. | **6-6-2018** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Todd L. McLawhorn**  **of Siprut PC**  **17 North Street**  **Suite 1600**  **Chicago, IL 60602**  **312 236-0000 (Ph.)**  **312 878-1342 (Fax)**  [**reception@siprut.com**](mailto:reception@siprut.com) |