|  **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **10-2-2016** | **16-CV-01352** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **John Kerr, et al. v. Zacks Investment Research, Inc. and Zacks Investment Management, Inc.**The Lawsuit alleges that Zacks Investment Management, Inc. (“ZIM”) and/or Zacks Investment Research, Inc. (“ZIR”) initiated, or caused to be initiated, certain telephone calls to the cellular telephones of certain customers, or potential customers, using an automatic telephone dialing system without first obtaining requisite consent, in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C.  | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write, call or e-mail:****Dostart Hannink & Coveney** **LLP****4180 La Jolla Village Drive****Suite 530****La Jolla, CA 92037****858 623-4265 (Ph.)****cklobucar@sdlaw.com** |
| **10-2-2017** | **16-CV-01183** | **(D. Utah)** | **Thompson, et al. v. 1-800 Contacts, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Arlington Contact Lens Service, Inc. and National Vision, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that 1-800 Contacts, Inc. entered into a series of settlement agreements with other online contact lens retailers, including Arlington Contact Lens Services, Inc., which limited each party’s ability to advertise its brand through internet search engines. Specifically, each settlement agreement allegedly prevented 1-800 Contacts, Inc. and its counter-party from having their company website links appear when a user executed a search for the other signatory’s trademark. Plaintiffs claim that these settlement agreements limited competition among the online contact lens retailers in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq. | **1-3-2018**Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more inforamtion write to:****Scott E. Gant****BOIES SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP****1401 New York Avenue, NW****Washington, DC 20005** |
| **10-2-2017** | **16-CV-02372** | **(D. Kan.)** | **Sarah Hapka v. CareCentrix, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that CareCentrix announced that it was targeted by a “spoofing” scam, and released the 2015 Internal Revenue Service Wage and Tax Statements (W-2 Forms) of approximately 1,986 current and former CareCentrix employees to an unknown third party. The information contained on the W-2 Forms included employees’ full names, addresses and ZIP codes, dates of birth, wages, and Social Security Numbers. | **2-15-2018** | **For more information write or call:****Barrett J. Vahle****STUEVE SIEGEL HANSON LLP****460 Nichols Road, Suite 200****Kansas City, MO 64112****816 714-7100 (Ph.)** |
| **10-2-2017** | **16-CV-00444** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Cnova N.V. Securities Litigation****Re Defendants: Cnova N.V. (“Cnova”), Vitor Faga de Almeida, German Quiroga, Emmanuel Grenier, Jean-Charles Naouri, Libano Miranda Barroso, Eleazar de Carvalho Filho, Didier Leveque, Ronaldo Iabrudi dos Santos Pereira, Arnaud Strasser, Fernando Tracanella, Nicolas Woussen, Yves Desjacques, and Bernard Oppetit, Morgan Stanley & Co. LLC, J.P. Morgan Securities LLC, Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Incorporated, Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC, Deutsche Bank Securities Inc., BNP Paribas Securities Corp., HSBS Securities (USA) Inc., Natixis Securities Americas LLC, and SG Americas Securities, LLC (collectively, the “Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that defendants made misrepresentations and omissions regarding Cnova NV’s financial condition and prospects in its public documents, including Cnova’s Registration Statement and Prospectus issued in connection with Cnova’s initial public offering of its ordinary shares on or about 11-19-2014. Plaintiffs further allege that the truth regarding Cnova’s financial condition and prospects were partially revealed on 1-28-2015, 12-18-2015, and 1-24- 2016, and that those persons and entities who purchased Cnova ordinary share between 11-19-2014 and 2-23-2016, inclusive (the “Class Period”) were damaged as a result. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Brower Piven****A Professional Corporation****David A.P. Brower****Daniel Kuznicki****475 Park Avenue South****33rd Floor****New York, NY 10016** |
| **10-3-2017** | **15-CV-03020** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Forcefield Energy Inc. Securities Litigation**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated federal securities laws by engaging in fraudulent schemes to artificially inflate the value of ForceField’s common stock, including hiring promoters to recruit and induce investors to purchase ForceField common stock. The operative Third Amended Complaint alleges that the misstatements and/or omissions artificially inflated the price of ForceField common stock, and that the share prices dropped in response to certain subsequent disclosures.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Jacob A. Goldberg** **Gonen Haklay****THE ROSEN LAW FIRM, P.A.** **101 Greenwood, Suite 440** **Jenkintown, PA 19046**  |
| **10-3-2917** | **16-CV-01254** | **(D. Del.)** | **Kozma v. Sieczkarek, et al.**The lawsuit is about the Amendment to NovaBay’s 2007 Omnibus Shareholder Plan approved by NovaBay stockholders on 5-26-2016, and the disclosures made by NovaBay in connection with the Amendment. The Settlement will resolve Plaintiff’s claims about theAmendment and the disclosures made in connection with the Amendment, and all related issues and claims. | **12-15-2017** | **For more informaation write, call e-mail:****William J. Fields****LEVI &KORSINKY, LLP****30 Broad Street, 24th Floor****New York, NY 10004****212 363-7500 (Ph.)****wfields@zlk.com** |
| **10-3-2017** | **16-CV-03711** | **(S.E.N.Y.)** | **In re: SSA Bonds Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Deutsche Bank AG and Deutsche Bank Securities, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants colluded and often secretly functioned as a unitary“super-desk” that greatly diminished overall competition in the market and enabled the conspirators to exert influence over the SSA bond market that would be impossible if they had been acting independently. Defendants allegedly undermined competition by engaging in numerous anticompetitive activities, including (a) fixing bond prices offered to investors; (b) strategically coordinating bids to avoid competing with one another; and (c) colluding to share sensitive competitive information with each other. Based on this conduct, Plaintiffs bring federal antitrust claims and state law claims against Defendants for unjust enrichment. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****MOTLEY RICE LLC****Michael M. Buchman****600 Third Avenue****Suite 2101****New York, NY 10016****212 577-0040 (Ph.)****212 577-0054 (Fax)****mbuchman@motleyrice.com** |
| **10-4-2017** | **11-CV-1773** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Smith, et al. v. Family Video Movie Club, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that Family Video violated Illinois law requiring hourly employees to make “off-the-clock” bank deposits and miscalculating hourly employees’ overtime pay by excluding commissions from the overtime rate during weeks in which they worked more than 40 hours. | **1-30-2018** | **For more information write or call:****Eric H. Gibbs** **David M. Berger** **Scott Grzenczyk** **GIRARD GIBBS LLP****505 14th Street****Suite 1110****Oakland, California 94612****510 350-9700 (Ph.)** |
| **10-4-2017** | **14-CV-2017** | **(W.D. Okla.)** | **Rickey Royal, Sandra Epperson and Greg Hurley v. Stoneridge, Inc., Stoneridge Control Devices, Inc. f/k/a Joseph Pollak Corp. (collectively, (“CSID”)**Plaintiffs claim that the clutch safety interlock devices (CSIDs) in certain Chrysler vehicles equipped with manual transmissions are defective because they contain return springs that may fatigue. CSIDs operate to prevent ignition unless a vehicle’s clutch pedal is depressed. Plaintiffs claim that fatigued return springs in a CSID can fail such that a driver is able to engage the engine starter motor without the clutch pedal being depressed, which could result in unintended vehicle movement without warning. The same alleged defect could also prevent engine start up without prior warning, which could cause a crash. Plaintiffs allege that Stoneridge is contractually obligated to indemnify owners of vehicles containing the CSIDs for damages they have sustained, namely the need to replace their CSIDs. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Jeffrey T. Embry****Hossley & Embry, LLP****515 S. Vine Avenue****Tyler, TX 75702****F. Leighton Durham III****Kelly, Durham & Pittard, LLP****P.O. Box 224626****Dallas, TX 75222** |
| **10-5-2017** | **15-CV-00575** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Rlhn v. Acadia Pharmaceuticals Inc., et al.**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by knowingly misrepresenting to the public during the Class Period that the Company’s New Drug Application for Nuplazid (the “NDA”) was on track for submission to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration by 3-31-2015, when in fact it was not. The Complaint alleges that Defendants’ purported misrepresentations were revealed to investors on 3-11-2015, when Defendants announced that the NDA submission would be delayed until the second half of 2015. The Complaint alleges that investors who purchased or otherwise acquired publicly traded ACADIA common stock and/or call options in the United States or on the NASDAQ Global Select Market during the Class Period suffered damages, as alleged therein. | **10-3-2017** | **For more inforamtion write or call:****W. Gonnello,****Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP** **685 Third Avenue****26th Floor****New York, NY 10017****212 983-9330 (Ph.)** |
| **10-5-2017** | **16-CV-01869** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **James Gormley v. magicJack Vocaltec, Ltd., Gerald Vento and Jose Gordo**Plaintiff alleges that magicJack and 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 magicJack’s business by telling investors that magicJack’s fourth-quarter and full year revenue for fiscal year 2013 would be less than previously announced. | **1-19-2018** | **For more information write or e-mail:****Nicholas I. Porritt****Levi & Korsinsky LLP****1101 30th Street, N.W.****Suite 115****Washington, D.C. 20007****nporritt@zlk.com** |
| **10-6-2017** | **12-MD-02311****13-CV-00803****14-CV-02903** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Anti-Vibration Rubber Parts****In re: Automotive Constant Velocity Joint Boots Products (End-Payor Plaintiffs)****Re Defendants: Toyo Tire & Rubber Co., Ltd., Toyo Tire North America OE Sales LLC and Toyo Automotive Parts (USA)**Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of Toyo’s participation in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for (1) Anti-Vibration Rubber Parts 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-00803, Doc. No. 195) (“Anti-Vibration Rubber Parts Complaint”), and (2) Automotive Constant Velocity Joint Boot Products (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. 2:14-cv-02903, Doc. No. 50) (“Automotive Constant Velocity Joint Boot Products 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****Susman Godfrey L.L.P.****1901 Avenue of the Stars Suite 950****Los Angeles, CA 90067** |
| **10-6-2017** | **15-CV-00748** | **(S.D. Ohio)** | **Vicki Linneman, et al. v. Vita-Mix Corporation, et al.**Plaintiffs allege that the top seals of the blade assembly in certain Vita-Mix containers may fleck, causing tiny bits of black material to enter food or drink during blending. These flecks are of a nonstick material (polytetrafluoroethylene or “PTFE”) that is common in cookware and many other products in the food industry.  | **3-28-2017** | **For more information write or call:****W.B. Markovits****Markovits, Stock & DeMarco,** **LLC****3825 Edwards Road****Suite 650****Cincinnati, Ohio 45209****513 651-3700 (Ph.)** |
| **10-6-2017** | **17-CV-60144** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Daniel A. Brna and James E. Scott v. Isle of Capri Casinos, Inc. and Interblock USA, LLC**Plaintiffs allege that the Interblock Organic Dice machines at Pompano Park Casino overcharged a commission on winning “Buy Bets” placed on an electronic craps game. A “Buy Bet” is a particular kind of craps bet that is placed on a specific point (the numbers 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 or 10) and which pays at or near to true odds. A Buy Bet wins when the specific point is rolled and loses when a 7 is rolled. The Plaintiffs claim that instead of charging a 5% commission on the bet amount – as set forth in the Organic Dice’s rules -- the Interblock Organic Dice machines charged a 5% commission on the winnings. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Cristina M. Pierson****Kelley/Uustal PLC****500 N. Federal Highway****#200****Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301** |
| **10-6-2017** | **15-CV-05089** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Dobkin v. NRG Residential Solar Solutions LLC**Plaintiff alleges that NRG Residential placed or had third parties place prerecorded and/or autodialed calls to the telephones of consumers without their consent promoting the sale and leasing of residential solar panel systems. The suit further alleges that these calls were made to individuals whose telephone numbers were registered on the National Do-Not-Call Registry. The lawsuit alleges that, as a result of these calls, NRG Residential violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Rafey S. Balabanian****Eve-Lynn J. Rapp** **EDELSON PC****123 Townsend Street****Suite 100****San Francisco, CA 94107** |
| **10-6-2017** | **14-CV-02740** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Zorrilla, et al. v. Carlson Restaurants Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Carlson Restaurants Worldwide Inc. and T.G.I. Friday’s Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the Fair Labor Standards Act and certain corresponding state laws by improperly taking the “tip credit” and by requiring Tipped Workers to work “off the clock” without compensation. Plaintiffs claim that Defendants: (i) failed to properly notify Tipped Workers of the tip credit; (ii) allowed Tipped Workers to spend more than 20% of their time on “non-tipped” duties; (iii) required Tipped Workers to perform duties “unrelated” to their occupations; and (iv) required Tipped Workers to share or “pool” tips with ineligible employees. Plaintiffs also assert that Defendants violated various state laws including, for example, by failing to pay all spread-of-hours pay owed, failing to reimburse uniform-related expenses, and failing to provide complete wage statements. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write to:****Justin M. Swartz****Outten & Golden LLP****685 Third Avenue****25th Floor****New York, NY 10017****212 245-1000 (Ph.)** |
| **10-6-2017** | **16-CV-10671** | **(D. Mass)** | **Hayes v. Citizen Financial Group, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Citizens Bank, N.A. f/k/a RBS Citizens Bank, N.A., and Citizens Bank of Pennsylvania**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants incorrectly charged and collected annual fees on certain Citizens Bank and Charter One Bank home equity line of credit (“HELOC”) and line of credit (“**LOC**”) accounts. | **2-22-2018** | **For more information visit or call:**[**www.citizensbankannualfeeclassactionsettlement.com**](http://www.citizensbankannualfeeclassactionsettlement.com)**1 844 402-8591 (Ph.)** |
| **10-9-2017** | **12-CV-05227** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Zaghian v. THQ Inc., et al.****Re Defendants:**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Brian J. Farrell and Paul J. Pucino (“Defendants”) violated Sections 10(b) and Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act of 1934. According to the Amended Complaint, Defendants violated these statutes by disseminating false and misleading information concerning THQ’s highly touted uDraw game. Specifically, the Amended Complaint alleges that Defendants assured investors that the market demand for the uDraw would “generate significant growth, profitability, and cash,” and result in the “largest quarter” in the Company’s history.However, within roughly one month of reiterating their confidence in the uDraw, Defendants lowered their expected net sales for the quarter by 25% due to weaker-than-expected uDraw sales. By early February 2012,Defendants revealed that uDraw sales were still far weaker than represented and, in fact, they would be ceasing production and distribution of the uDraw altogether as well as taking a $30.3 million impairment charge. When this information became public, the Amended Complaint alleges that the share price fell and shareholders were damaged. The lawsuit seeks money damages against Defendants for alleged violations of the federal securities laws. | **11-6-2017** | **For more information write to:****Nicholas I, Porritt****LEVI & KORSINSKY LLP****1101 30th Street NW****Washington, D.C. 20007** |
| **10-10-2017** | **12-MD-02311****13-CV-00903****13-CV-01003****13-CV-01103****13-CV-01203****13-CV-01903****13-CV-02103****13-CV-02203****13-CV-02303****13-CV-02803** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation –End-Payor Plaintiffs****In re: Windshield Wiper Systems****In re: Radiators****In re: Starters****In re: Automotive Lamps****In re: Electric Power Steering Assemblies****In re: Fan Motors****In re: Fuel Injection Systems****In re: Power Window Motors****In re: Windshield Washer Systems****Re Defendants: MITSUBA Corporation and American Mitsuba Corporation**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants, manufacturers and suppliers of Automobile Parts globally and in the United States, for engaging in a massive, decade-long conspiracy to unlawfully fix and artificially raise the prices of these products. Defendants’ conspiracy successfully targeted the long-struggling United States automotive industry, raising prices for car manufacturers and consumers alike. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write, call, fax or e-mail:****ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER &** **CIRESI L.L.P****Hollis Salzman****Bernard Persky****William V. Reiss****601 Lexington Avenue****Suite 3400****New York, NY 10022****212 980-7400 (Ph.)****212 980-7499 (Fax)****hsalzman@rkmc.com****bpersky@rkmc.com****wreiss@rkmc.com** |
| **10-11-2017** | **16-CV-00911** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Wendy Grasso and Nicholas Grasso v. Electrolux Home Products, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that some Electrolux-manufactured high efficiency front loading washing machines fail to adequately self-clean themselves of laundry residue, resulting in mold, mildew and/or Odor Issues inside the washer that also can ruin laundry. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write:****R. Brent Irby****McCallum, Hoaglund, &** **Irby, LLP****905 Montgomery Highway****Suite 201****Vestavia Hills AL 35216** |
| **10-11-2017** | **15-MD-24009** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **In re: Takata Airbag Products Liability Litigation**The lawsuit alleges that certain automotive companies, including Subaru, manufactured, distributed, or sold certain vehicles containing allegedly defective Takata Airbag Inflators manufactured by Defendants Takata Corporation and TK Holdings, Inc. that allegedly could, upon deployment, rupture and expel debris or shrapnel into the occupant compartment and/or otherwise affect the airbag’s deployment, and that the plaintiffs sustained economic losses as a result. The lawsuit claims violations of various state consumer protection statutes. | **10-25-2017** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Peter Prieto****Podhurst Orseck, P.A.****SunTrust International** **Center****One S.E. 3rd Avenue, Suite 2700****Miami, Florida 33131****305 358-2800 (Ph.)****pprieto@podhrst.com** |
| **10-11-2017** | **16-CV-0230** | **(W.D. Penn.)** | **Thomas Martinez and Michael Cabrero, et al. v. PPG Industries, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that Defendant willfully violated the federal Fair Credit Reporting Act (“FCRA”), 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(2), by failing to make a clear and conspicuous disclosure in writing that a consumer report would be obtained for employment purposes, in a document that consists solely of the disclosure. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Laura L. Ho****GOLDSTEIN, BORGEN**  **DARDARIAN & HO****300 Lakeside Drive****Suite 1000****Oakland, California 94612****510 763-9800 (Ph.)** |
| **10-11-2017** | **15-CV-06942** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Vergara, et al. v. Uber Technologies, Inc.**Plaintiffs claim that Defendant sent text messages in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.* ("TCPA"), from 12-31-2010 to 8-17-2017 ("Class Period"). | **1-23-2018** | **For more inforamtion visit or call:**[**www.UberTCPASettlement.com**](http://www.UberTCPASettlement.com)**1 800-330-1683 (Ph.)** |
| **10-13-2017** | **17-CV-01252** | **(E.D. Mo.)** | **Rawa, et al. v. Monsanto Company**Plaintiffs allege that Monsanto advertised Roundup® Concentrate Plus and Roundup® Super Concentrate as making more spray solution than the products were capable of producing when concentrates were diluted. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Jack Fitzgerald****The Law Office of** **Jack Fitzgerald, PC****3636 4th Avenue****Suite. 202****San Diego, CA 92103** |
| **10-13-2017** | **16-CV-00503** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Tessa Koenig, Nila Cabistan, Jennie Holguin, Samantha Rex, Ana Sandez, Zena Pavia, Amirah Husbands, and Pearl Amaechi v. Lime Crime, Inc., a New York Corporation**Plaintiffs allege that Lime Crime discovered that malicious software was installed on the third party computer server that hosted its website. This server stored certain personally identifiable information (“PII”) of Lime Crime customers, which may have included names, addresses, website logins, and payment information. Customers’ PII may have been exposed between 10-4-2014 and 2-15-2015. In or around February 2015, Lime Crime sent Incident Notices to potentially affected customers to notify them of the Incident and offer one year of complimentary identity protection and fraud resolution. The lawsuit claims that Lime Crime maintained inadequate data security practices and delayed notifying customers of the incident. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****William B. Federman****Joshua D. Wells****FEDERMAN & SHERWOOD****10205 North Pennsylvania Ave.****Oklahoma City, OK 73120** |
| **10-16-2017** | **12-CV-5224** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Barrett, et al. v. Forest Laboratories, Inc., et al.**Plaintiffs alleged that: (i) Forest discriminated against the Class on the basis of their gender with respect to their compensation, in violation of Title VII and the EPA; (ii) Forest discriminated against the Class on the basis of their gender with respect to promotions, in violation of Title VII; and (iii) Forest discriminated against the Class on the basis of pregnancy, including with respect to their pay and promotions, in violation of Title VII. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write, call or fax:****SANFORD HEISLER SHARP, LLP****1350 Avenue of the Americas 31st Floor****New York, NY 10019****646 402-5650 (Ph.)****646 402-5651 (Fax)** |
| **10-16-2017** | **11-MD-2262****11-CV-2613** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: LIBOR-Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litigation**Plaintiffs allege that the Citigroup Defendants participated in an unlawful conspiracy to restrain trade by agreeing to manipulate the U.S. Dollar London Interbank Offered Rate (“USD LIBOR”) between 1-1-2003 and 5-31-2010. Exchange-Based Plaintiffs claim that this alleged manipulation affected the value and settlement price of their exchange-traded Eurodollar futures and options contracts. Plaintiffs assert claims under Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §§1 et seq. and the Commodity Exchange Act, 7 U.S.C. §1 et seq., as well as common law claims for restitution, disgorgement, and unjust enrichment.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Christopher Lovell** **LOVELL STEWART HALEBIAN**  **JACOBSON LLP** **61 Broadway, Suite 501** **New York, NY 10006****212 608-1900 (Ph.)****David Kovel** **KIRBY MCINERNEY LLP****825 Third Avenue****16th Floor****New York, New York 10022** **212 317-2300 (Ph.)** |
| **10-17-2017** | **14-CV-00226** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Hatamian v. Advanced Micro Devices****Re Defendants: Rory P. Read, Thomas J. Seifert, Richard A. Bergman, and Dr. Lisa T. Su**Plaintiff alleges that during the Class Period, a majority of Advanced Micro Devices (“AMD’s”) revenue was derived from the sale of computer microprocessors, chipsets, and embedded processors, while the remainder of its revenue came primarily from the sale of graphics, video, and multimedia products. Class Representatives’ claims center on the launch of AMD’s “Llano” microprocessor, an Accelerated Processing Unit (“APU”) product that combined a Computer Processing Unit (“CPU”) with a Graphics Processing Unit (“GPU”) onto one piece of silicon. As detailed in the operative complaint, Class Representatives allege that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements and omissions concerning Llano’s production, launch, demand, and sales, among other things. Class Representatives further allege that when certain disclosures pertaining to Llano’s production and supply and the related impact on AMD’s financial results and inventories were made, AMD’s stock price fell, allegedly damaging class members. | **Not set yet** | **For more informtion write to:****Labaton Sucharow LLP****Jonathan Gardner****140 Broadway****New York, NY 10005****Motely Rice LLC****James M. Hughes****28 Bridgeside Blvd.****Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464** |
| **10-19-2017** | **13-CV-00802** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation (Indirect Purchasers)****Re Defendants: Bridgestone Corporation and Bridgestone APM Company**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants’ and their co-conspirators’ combinations or conspiracieshad the following effects: (1) Anti-Vibration Rubber Part price competition was restrained,suppressed, and eliminated throughout the District of Columbia; (2) Anti-Vibration Rubber Part prices were raised, fixed, maintained and stabilized at artificially high levels throughout the District of Columbia; (3) Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class were deprived of free and open competition; and (4) Plaintiffs and members of the Damages Class paid supra-competitive, artificially inflated prices for Anti-vibration Rubber Parts. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion 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 l0022****Susman Godfrey L.L.P.****1901 A venue of the Stars Suite 950****Los Angeles, CA 90067** |
| **10-19-2017** | **17-CV-1204** | **(D. Md.)** | **Anderson v. Burger King Corp.**Plaintiff alleges that certain Burger King® restaurants charged a higher price for two modified CROISSAN’WICH® breakfast sandwiches (each a “Croissan’wich”) when consumers redeemed a buy-one-get-one-free (“BOGO”) coupon than they would have if the consumer had purchased a single unmodified Croissan’wich without a BOGO coupon. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN**  **& DOWD LLP****ROXANA PIERCE****1701 K Street NW****Suite 350****Washington, DC 20036****202 822-6762(Ph.)** |
| **10-19-2017** | **17-CV-04692** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Strache, et al. v. SCI Direct, Inc. d/b/a Neptune Society**Plaintiffs allege Service Corporation International SCI Direct violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act when SCI or companies working on its behalf made calls through the use of an artificial or prerecorded voice and did not have the recipients’ permission to make these calls, and made calls to consumers without a proper “Do Not Call” policy in effect. | **3-14-2018** | **For more informtion write to:****Jeremy Glapion****Glapion Law Firm, LLC****1704 Maxwell Drive****Wall, NJ 07719** |
| **10-19-2017** | **11-CV-2613** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Metzler Investment GmbH, et al. v. Credit Suisse Group AG, et al****Re Defendant: HSBC Bank plc**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the Sherman Act and Commodity Exchange Act, as well as common law claims, in connection with HSBC’s and other defendant banks’ USD LIBOR submissions during the 1-1-2003 through 5-31-2011 class period (the “Class Period”). The Action – referred to as the “Exchange-Based Action” in MDL proceeding; In re: LIBOR-Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litigation, No. 11-MD-2262 (NRB) – was brought by plaintiffs on behalf of a putative class of investors who transacted in Eurodollar futures and/or options on Eurodollar futures on exchange during the Class Period. | **`****Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Christopher Lovell****Lovell Stewart Halebian Jacobson LLP****61 Broadway, Suite 501****New York, NY 10006****212 608-1900 (Ph.)****David Kovel****Kirby McInerney LLP****825 Third Aveue****26th Floor****New York, NY 10022****212 317-2300 (Ph.)** |
| **10-20-2017** | **11-CV-2613** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Metzler Investment GMbH v. Credit Suisse Group AG****Re Defendant: Deutsche Bank AG, Deutsche Bank Securities Inc., and DB Group Services (UK) Ltd. (together, “Deutsche Bank” or the “Bank”)**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants understated their borrowing costs to the British Bankers’ Association (“BBA”) (thereby suppressing LIBOR) to portray themselves as economically healthier than they actually were—of particular importance given investors’ trepidation in light of the widespread market turmoil of the past few years. Plaintiffs allege that artificially suppressing LIBOR allowed Defendants to pay lower interest rates on LIBOR-based financial instruments that Defendants sold to investors, and otherwise affect the price for LIBOR-based derivatives like Eurodollar futures. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write or call:****Christopher Lovell****Lovell Stewart Halebian Jacobson LLP****61 Broadway, Suite 501****New York, NY 10006****212 608-1900 (Ph.)****David Kovel****Kirby McInerney LLP****825 Third Aveue****26th Floor****New York, NY 10022****212 317-2300 (Ph.)** |
| **10-20-2017** | **17-CV-07425** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Marcus v. OCO Biomedical, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that OCO sent unsolicited facsimile advertisements in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Paris Ackerman & Schmierer** **LLP****Ross H. Schmierer****103 Eisenhower Parkway****Roseland, NJ 07068****973 2286667 (Ph)** |
| **10-20-2017** | **16-CV-01780** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Zeve Baumgarten, et al. v. CleanWell, LLC**Plaintiffs allege that Defendant manufactures, sells, and distributes the Products using a marketing and advertising campaign with claims that its Products are “Natural” and/or “All-Natural”. However, Plaintiffs allege Defendant’s claims are false, deceptive, and misleading because the Products contain artificial and synthetic ingredients. It is further alleged that Defendant’s conduct violated and continues to violate New York General Business Law §§ 349 and 350, the consumer protection statutes of all 50 states, and the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act. Plaintiffs also allege Defendant breached and continues to breach its express and implied warranties regarding the Products, and that Defendant has been, and continues to be unjustly enriched. | **2-9-2018** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****The Sultzer Law Group P.C.****Jason P. Sultzer****Joseph Lipari****85 Civic Center Plaza****Suite 104****Poughkeepsie, NY 12601****845 483-7100 (Ph.)****888 749-7747 (Fax)****sultzerj@thesultzerlawgroup.com****liparij@thesultzerlawgroup.com** |
| **10-20-2017** | **16-CV-00255** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Ford v. Natural Health Trends Corp.****Re Defendants: NHTC, Chris T. Sharng, Timothy****S. Davidson, and George K. Broady**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act of 1934. Plaintiffs contend that Defendants made statements during the Class Period which falsely assured investors that NHTC was in compliance with Chinese laws governing multilevel marketing, and was not engaged in multilevel marketing in China, and thus concealed the substantial risk that NHTC could face severe legal and regulatory penalties in China, including that NHTC’s China operations representing more than 90% of its global revenue could be shut down and that NHTC could face substantial monetary penalties. The Consolidated Complaint alleges that, when these risks became public, NHTC’s share price fell and shareholders were damaged. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Nicholas I. Porritt****LEVI & KORSINSKY LLP****1101 30th Street NW****Washington, D.C. 20007** |
| **10-20-2017** | **12-MD-02311****13-CV-00802****14-CV-02902** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Anti-Vibration Rubber Parts****In re: Automotive Constant Velocity Joint Boots Products (Indirect Purchasers)****Re Defendants: Toyo Tire & Rubber Co., Ltd., Toyo Tire North America Manufacturing Inc., Toyo Tire Nort6h America OE Sales LLC, and Toyo Automotive Parts (USA), Inc. (collectively, “Toyo”)**See CAFA Notice dated 10-6-2017 page 7 above for more information. | **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****4725 Wisconsin Avenue, NW****Suite 200****Washington, DC 20016** |
| **10-20-2017** | **12-CV-02311****13-CV-00902****13-CV-01002****13-CV-01102****13-CV-01202****13-CV-01902****13-CV-02102****13-CV-02202****13-CV-02302****13-CV-02802** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Litigation****In re: Windshield wiper Systems****In re: Radiators****In re: Starters****In re: Automotive Lamps****In re: Electric Power Starring Assemblies****In re: Fan Motors****In re: Fuel Injection Systems****In re: Power Window Motors****In re: Windshield Washer Systems****Re Defendants: Mitsuba Corporation and American Mitsuba Corporation (together “Defendants”)**See CAFA Notice dated 10-10-2017 page 11 above for more information. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion 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** |
| **10-20-2017** | **16-CV-00087** | **(E.D. Okla.)** | **Dorsey J. Reirdon v. XTO Energy Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to pay statutory interest on royalty payments made by Defendant (or on behalf of Defendant) outside the time periods set forth in the Production Revenue Standards Act, 52 Okl. St. §570.10 (the “PRSA”) for oil and gas production proceeds from oil and gas wells in Oklahoma. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges Defendant: (1) failed to pay statutory interest on royalty payments made outside the time periods set forth in the PRSA; (2) awaited a demand prior to paying statutory interest under the PRSA; (3) misrepresented and/or omitted the amount of statutory interest owed; and (4) is liable to Class Members for breach of the PRSA, actual fraud, constructive fraud, deceit, unjust enrichment/disgorgement, accounting punitive damages, and injunctive relief. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Bradley E. Beckworth****Nix, Patterson & Roach,LLP****3600 North Capital**  **of Texas Hwy.,** **Suite 350B****Austin, Texas 78746****512 328-5333 (Ph.)****512 328-5335 (Fax)****bbeckworth@nixlaw.com** |
| **10-23-2017** | **12-MD-02311****15-CV-14096** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Alternators relating to All Truck & Equipment Dealership Actions** **Re Defendants: Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Mitsubishi Electric US Holdings, Inc., and Mitsubishi Electric Automotive America, Inc. (collectively “Mitsubishi Electric”)**See CAFA Notice dated 10-20-2017 page 11 above for more information. | **2-28-2018** | **For more information write or call:****Wayne A. Mack****J. Manly Parks****Duane Morris LLP****30 S. 17th Street****Philadelphia, PA 19103****215 979-1000 (Ph.)** |
| **10-23-2017** | **15-CV-0387** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Leung v. XPO Logistics, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that XAPO Logistics, Inc. (“XPO”) violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 by making prerecorded survey calls regarding Ikea deliveries to cell phones without the prior express consent of Leung or the putative class members.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Keith J. Keogh****Keogh Law, LTD.****55 W. Monroe Street****Suite 3390****Chicago, IL 60603** |
| **10-24-2017** | **15-CV-02184** | **(D. Minn.)** | **Beecroft v. Altisource Business Solutions Pvt. Ltd.**Plaintiff alleges that Altisource Business Solutions Pvt. Ltd. violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., by contacting Plaintiff and class members on their cellular telephone using automated calling equipment without the express consent to do so. | **3-18-2018** | **For more information write or call:****Mark L. Heaney****HEANEY LAW FIRM, LLC****601 Carlson Parkway****Suite 1050****Minnetonka, MN 55305****952 933-9655 (Ph.)** |
| **10-24-2017** | **16-CV-03993** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Shank v. Health Care Services Corporation, et al.****Re Defendants: BlueShield of Illinois, and Prime Therapeutics LLC.**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the law by applying its Prescription Drug Coverage Guidelines for the drug Harvoni to limit coverage of Harvoni under Settlement Class Members’ health insurance and/or benefit plans to those with advance liver scarring. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Natelie Lesser****Kessler Topaz Meltzer &**  **Check, LLP****280 King of Prussa Road****Radnor, PA 19087****610 667-7706 (Ph.)****610 667-7056 (Fax)** |
| **10-25-2017** | **14-CV-011600** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Thomas, et al. v. MagnaChip Semiconductor Corp., et al.****Re Defendants: Avenue Capital Management II, L.P.**Plaintiffs allege that MagnaChip engaged in illicit accounting practices, including recognizing revenue for sales that never occurred and products that never shipped. The Action also alleges that Avenue Capital was a control person of MagnaChip, and that Avenue Capital sold MagnaChip shares while in the possession of nonpublic, material information. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Joshua B. Silverman****POMERANTZ LLP****10 South LaSalle****Suite 3505****Chicago, IL 60603****312 377-1181 (Ph.)** |
| **10-25-2017** | **13-CV-05795** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **In re: Stericycle, Inc., Sterisafe Contract Litigation**Plaintiff alleges that that Stericycle engaged in a practice of imposing Automated Price Increases in violation of the contracts between Stericycle and certain of its Small Quantity (SQ) medical waste customers and engaged in unfair and deceptive acts or practices by misrepresenting or concealing material facts from its customers regarding its pricing practices. As a result, the lawsuit pursues claims for breach of contract and violations of various state consumer protection statutes, among other claims.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Steve W. Berman****Hagens Berman Sobol**  **Shapiro LLP****1918 Eighth Ave.****Suite 3300****Seattle, WA 98101** |
| **10-27-2017** | **14-CV-04744** | **(D.N.Y.)** | **Cline, et al. v. TouchTunes Music Corporation**Plaintiffs allege that TouchTunes who is a provider of digital jukebox services and also operates a mobile App which allows users to purchase credits to play songs on its digital jukeboxes. To use TouchTunes’ services, users agree to its Terms of Use. Plaintiffs claim that, before 10-28-2013, the Terms of Use did not adequately inform TouchTunes’ users that a song they purchased using credits from the mobile App might not play due to the ability of a person to skip a purchased song using a TouchTunes-branded remote control. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Jeffrey M. Norton****NEWMAN FERRARA LLP****1250 Broadway****27th Floor****New York, NY 10001** |
| **10-27-2017** | **15-CV-10148** | **(M.D. Tenn.)** | **Rodriguez, et al. v. Providence Community Corrections, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Rutherford County, Tennessee; Providence Community Corrections, Inc., now known as Pathways Community Corrections, Inc.; Jasmine Jackson; Briana Woodlee; Amanda Roberts; Tiarra Smith; and Nisha Hyde** The lawsuit alleges that Pathways Community Corrections, Inc. (“PCC”) and other defendants extorted illegal fees from individuals on probation. Plaintiffs incurred court imposed financial obligations arising from a traffic or misdemeanor case in Rutherford County General Sessions or Circuit Court, and were supervised on probation in that case by PCC or Rutherford County’s Probation Department. The lawsuit alleges violations of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (civil RICO statutes), other federal and state statutes, the due process and equal protection rights under the U.S. Constitution, and the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The lawsuit also alleges abuse of process.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Elizabeth Rossi****Civil Rights Corps****910 17th Street NW****Suite 500****Washington, DC 20006****202 599-0953 (Ph.)** |
| **10-27-2017** | **12-MD-02311****13-CV-00902** **13-CV-01102****13-CV-02202****15-CV-03002** | **(E.D.M.I.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation** **Auto-Deal Plaintiffs (“ADs”)****Windshield Wiper Systems Action****Starter Action****Fuel Injection Systems****Spark Plugs, Oxygen Sensors, and Air Fuel Radio Sensors Action****Re Defendants: Robert Bosch LLC and Robert Bosch GmbH (“Bosch”)**See CAFA Notice dated 10-10-2017 page 11 above for more information. | **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****4725 Wisconsin Avenue, NW****Washinton, DC 20016** |
| **10-27-2017** | **17-CV-488** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **Guerra v. Progressive Casualty Insurance Company**The lawsuit alleges that Progressive excluded child care subsidy payments in determining the regular rates for overtime compensation paid to Plaintiff and other hourly employees in workweeks in which they worked over 40 hours. The lawsuit asserts claims under the federal Fair Labor Standards Act seeking overtime compensation for all employees who received child care subsidy payments. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Shannon M. Draher****Hans A. Nilges****NILGES DRAHER LLC****7266 Portage Street NW****Suite D****Massillon, OH 44646****330 470-4429 (Ph.)** |
| **10-30-2017** | **14-CV-03601** | **(D.S.C.)** | **Myriam Fejzulai v. Sam’s West, Inc.****Re Defendants: Sam’s east, Inc., and Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (collectively “Sam’s Club”)**The lawsuit claims that Sam’s Club at times did not fully honor the Freshness Guarantee with respect to certain fresh produce purchased at Sam’s Club retail location within the United States. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Richardson, Patrick,** **Westbrook & Brickman, LLC****1037 Chuck Dawley Blvd.,**  **Bldg. A****P.O. Box 1007****Mt. Pleasant, S.C. 29464** |
| **10-30-2017** | **16-CV-01452** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Cannon, et al. v. Ashburn Corporation, et al.****Re Defendants: Ashburn Corporation, Wines Til Sold Out (WTSO.COM.) and Jonathan H Newman**Plaintiffs allege that because certain wines were not sold anywhere at the purported “Original Price,” the discount advertised by WTSO.Com (WTSO) was not real, and consumers where not buying wines at a discount. 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 that 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 Center Street****6th Floor****New York, NY 10013****James E. Cecchi****Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Broady & Agnello,** **P.C.****5 Becker Farm Road****Roseland, NJ 07068** |
| **10-31-2017** | **15-CV-00748** | **(D. Ohio)** | **Vicki Linneman, et al. v. Vita-Mix Corporation, et al.**See CAFA Notice dated 10-6-2017 page 8 above for more information. | **3-27-2018** | **For more inforamtion write to:****Bill Markovits****Markovits, Stock &** **DeMarco, LLC****3825 Edwards Road****Suite 650****Cincinnati, OH 45209** |
| **10-31-2017** | **16-2-05818-3****16-CV-00756** | **(W.D. Wash.)** | **Hammond v. Blanco****Nahar v. Bloanco**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants breached their duties of loyalty, care and good faith by: (i) issuing and/or permitting to be issued false and misleading statements about the Company’s business, operations and prospects and/or failing to disclose (a) that pacritinib was attributed to a potential cause in the death and injuries of several patients; (b) that the Company’s clinical trials showed the dangers of pacritinib usage; and (c) that the Company’s new drug application for pacritinib would likely be withdrawn; (ii) consciously disregarding the recommendation by the IDMC in place during the PERSIST trials advising against allowing patients to crossover; (iii) failing to exercise their oversight duties by not monitoring safety while the pacritinib clinical trials were taking place especially after being put on notice that the IDMC advised against allowing patients to crossover; (iv) failing to make modifications to its ongoing pacritinib clinical trials when put on notice that the design of the PERSIST clinical trials could result in in non-statistically significant safety concerns; and (v) failing to maintain and/or implement a system of effective internal controls and procedures with respect to the development and commercialization of pacritinib. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****State Plaintiffs’ Counsel:****Phillip Kim****The Rosen Law Firm, P.A.****275 Madison Avenue, 34th Floor****New York, NY 10016****212 686-1060 (Ph.)****Federal Plaintiffs’ Counsel:****Stuart J. Guber****Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP****101 Greenwood Avenue** **Suite 600****Jenkintown, PA 19046****215 277-5770 ext. 413 (Ph.)** |
| **10-31-2017** | **16-CV-00087** | **(E.D. Oka.)** | **Dorsey J. Reirdon v. XTO Energy Inc.**Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, Certifying the Class for Settlement Purposes, Approving Form and Manner of Notice, and Setting Date for Finial Fairness Hearing. See CAFA Notice dated 10-20-2017 page 21 above for more information. | **1-24-2018** | **For more information write:****Bradley E. Beckworth****Nix, Patterson & Roach,LLP****3600 North Capital**  **of Texas Hwy.** **Suite 350B****Austin, Texas 78746** |