|  **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **7-2-2018** | **14-CV-01183** | **(D.D.C.)** | **Howard v. Liquidity Services, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Liquidity Services Inc., William P. Angrick III, James M. Rallo and Kathryn A. Domino (collectively, “Defendants”)**Plaintiffs claim that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements and failed to disclose information to investors about the financial performance of the Company's retail division in violation of the Exchange Act. Lead Plaintiffs further allege that the false and misleading statements and omissions inflated the price of LSI's common stock and that, when Defendants later disclosed the truth that the retail division was not performing as strongly as previously touted, and that LSI's retail growth could not be sustained, LSI's stock price dropped. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, e-mail or call:****Jonathan Gardner****LABATON SUCHAROW LLP****140 Broadway****New York, NY 10005**[**www.labaton.com**](http://www.labaton.com)**888 219-6877 (Ph.)** |
| **7-2-2018** | **9-CV-2056** | **(S.D. Tex.)** | **Torres v. SGE Management, LLC, et al.****Re Defendants: SGE Management, LLC, Stream Gas & Electric, Ltd., Stream SPE GP, LLC, Stream SPE, Ltd., Ignite Holdings, Ltd., Chris Domhoff, Rob Snyder, Pierre Koshakji, Douglas Witt, Steve Flores, Michael Tacker, Donny Anderson, Trey Dyer, Steve Fisher, Randy Hedge, Brian Lucia, Logan Stout and Presley Swagerty (collectively, “Defendants”)**The Plaintiffs sued the Defendants claiming that they lost money because Defendants allegedly violated the federal RacketeerInfluenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO). The Defendants vigorously denied these allegations and contended that they have no merit because Stream serves hundreds of thousands of energy customers and compensates IAs only in relation to actual energy sales.  | **10-4-2018**Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Scott M. Clearman****The Clearman Law Firm, PLLC****P.O. Box 541999****Houston, TX 77254****877 285-1473 (Ph.)**[**www.clearmanlaw.com**](http://www.clearmanlaw.com) |
| **7-3-2018** | **12-MD-02311** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Hitachi Automotive Systems, Ltd. (“HIAMS”), Hitachi Automotive Systems Americas, Inc., and Hitachi, Ltd. (collectively, “HIAMS Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants conspired to raise, fix, maintain, and stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate the supply of Fuel Injection Systems sold in the United States, in violation of federal antitrust laws. Plaintiff further alleges that as a result of the conspiracy, it and other direct purchasers of Fuel Injection Systems were injured by paying more for those products than they would have paid in the absence of the alleged illegal conduct, of costs and an award of attorneys’ and it seeks recovery of treble damages, together with reimbursement fees. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****KOHN, SWIFT & GRAF, P.C.****One South Broad Street, Suite 2100****Philadelphia, PA 19107** |
| **7-3-2018** | **12-MD-02311** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Side Door Latches****Re Defendants: Brose SchlieBsystem GmbH & Co. Kommanditgesellschaft and Brose North America (together, “Brose”)**Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of Brose'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 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’ Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint to be filed (“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** |
| **7-3-2018** | **13-CV-02202** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Fuel Injection Systems Cases (Automobile Dealership Action)****Re Defendants: Keihin Corporation and Keihin North America, Inc. (collectively, “Keihin”)**Plaintiffs allege that Keihin “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 Fuel Injection Systems.”  | **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 30016** |
| **7-5-2018** | **15-CV-00711** | **(D. Del.)** | **Hurwitz v. Mullins, et al., C.A.****Re Defendants: Scott W. Smith, Richard A. Roberts, W. Richard Anderson, Bruce W. McCullough and Loren Singletary (the “VNR Defendants”) and Eric Mullins, Charles W. Adcock, Jonathan C. Farber, Townes G. Pressler, Jr., John A. Bailey, and Jonathan P. Carroll (the “LRE Defendants” and collectively with the VNR Defendants, the “Defendants)**Plaintiff alleges that the Registration Statement and Proxy misrepresented or failed to disclose material information concerning Vanguard's ability to maintain compliance with certain debt covenants in its credit facility. The Complaint also alleges that the Registration Statement and Proxy misrepresented or failed to disclose material information concerning the impact of Vanguard's debt covenants on the Company's ability to pay unit holder distributions. Further, the Complaint alleges that members of the Class were damaged by Defendants' alleged material misrepresentations and omissions in the Registration Statement and Proxy. | **12-14-2018** | **For more information visit:**[**www.LRREnergySecuritiesLitigation.com**](http://www.LRREnergySecuritiesLitigation.com) |
| **7-6-2018** | **17-CV-02092** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Fowler, et al. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.**This lawsuit alleges that Wells Fargo breached the promissory notes underlying the class’s FHA insured home loans when it collected post-payment interest (i.e., interest for the remainder of the month during which the loan was paid off) without providing a certain type of disclosure to borrowers who made a pre-payment inquiry, request for payoff figures, or tender of prepayment. The FHA insured loans at issue were: (1) entered into between 6-1-1996 and 1-20-2015 (2) prepaid within the status of limitations applicable to the loans, and (3) for which Wells Fargo, its agent, or its predecessor was the mortgagee. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:****Adam L. Hoipkemier****Kevin Epps****Epps Holloway DeLoach &** **Hoipkemier LLP****6 Concourse Parkway, Suite 2920****Atlanta, GA 30328****adam@ehdlaw.com****kevin@ehdlaw.com** |
| **7-6-2018** | **17-CV-2002** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Foreman v. Solera Holding, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that Solera violated certain duties with respect to the personal data of employees when the employees’ W-2 data was compromised by an unauthorized third party on or about 2-14-2017 (the “Data Disclosure”). Solera denies any wrongdoing and denies all claims asserted against it in the lawsuit. Both sides have agreed to settle the lawsuit solely to avoid the cost, delay, and uncertainty of litigation. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****John A. Yanchunis****MORGAN & MORGAN COMPLEX**  **LITIGATION GROUP****201 N. Franklin Street****7th Floor****Tampa, FL 33602****813 223-5505 (Ph.)** |
| **7-6-2018** | **12-MD-02311** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation (Fuel Injection System) Direct Purchaser****Re Defendants: Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Mitsubishi Electric AUS Holdings, Inc. and Mitsubishi Electric Automotive America, Inc. (the “Mitsubishi Electric Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants conspired to raise, fix, maintain, and stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate the supply of Fuel Injection Systems sold in the United States, in violation of federal antitrust laws. Plaintiff further alleges that as a result of the conspiracy, it and other direct purchasers of Fuel Injection Systems were injured by paying more for those products than they would have paid in the absence of the alleged illegal conduct, and it seeks recovery of treble damages, with reimbursement of costs and an award of attorneys’ fees. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Freed Kanner London &** **Millen LLC****2201 Waukegan Road****Suite 130****Bannockburn, IL 60015****Preti, Flaherty,**  **Beliveau & Pachios LLP****One City Center****P.O. Box 9546****Portland, ME 04101** |
| **7-9-2018** | **14-CV-01983** | **(D.D.C.)** | **Valerie McMullen v. Synchrony Bank, et al.**Plaintiff alleges that One World Fitness, Bullen Wellness, Washington Chiropractic, Karim Steward and/or Dr. Wayne Bullen opened and/or charged CareCredit accounts on behalf of Plaintiff and the Settlement Class without authorization and/or consent. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Regan Zambri Long PLLC****Salvatore J. Zambri****1919 M Street, N.W.****Suite 350****Washington, D.C. 20036** |
| **7-9-2018** | **15-CV-5754** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Electrobras Securities Litigation****Re Defendants: Centrais Elétricas Brasileiras S.A. (“Eletrobras,” or the “Company”), José da Costa Carvalho Neto, and Armando Casado de Araújo (collectively, the “Settling Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that several Eletrobras statements filed with the SEC between 8-17-2010 and 6-24-2015 (the “Class Period”) were materially false and misleading when made, and omitted material facts necessary to make the statements not misleading because, among other reasons, Defendants either knew, or deliberately disregarded, facts regarding a massive bribery and corruption scheme that reached the highest levels of the Eletrobras, which subsequently became the subject of major investigations conducted by both Brazilian and U.S. regulators and/or law enforcement agencies. The Complaint further alleges that these materially false and misleading statements caused Eletrobras’ common and preferred American Depositary Shares (“ADAs”) to trade at artificially inflated prices. The Complaint alleges that as the truth about Defendants’ Class Period misstatements was revealed, it caused Eletrobras’ common and preferred ADS prices to drop significantly. | **12-5-2-18** | **For more information write, visit or call:****Donald R. Hall****Kaplan Fox &** **Kilsheimer LLP****850 Third Avenue****14th Floor****New York, NY 10022**[**www.eletrobrassecuritieslitigation.com**](http://www.eletrobrassecuritieslitigation.com)**212 687-1980 (Ph.)** |
| **7-9-2018** | **17-CV-1350** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **McCalvin, et al. v. Condor Holdco Securitization Trust, et al.****Re Defendants: Condor Assetco Securitization Trust, and Condor Recovery Securitization (the “Condor Trusts”)**The lawsuit claims that the Trusts violated the Uniform Commercial Code by failing to send borrows proper notice of their rights after repossessing their cars. Plaintiffs say the Trusts violated the Uniform Commercial Code because; a) their notice did not state the specific method of disposition (whether a public or private auction); or b) their notice did not list the time and place of any public sale of the vehicle, if any, for such an auction; or c) their notice did not adequately describe the secured party; or d) the Trust sent no notice at all.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Cary L. Flitter****Flitter Milz, P.C.****450 N. Narberth Avenue****Suite 101****Narberth, PA 19072** |
| **7-9-2018** | **16-MD-02687** | **(D.N.J.)** | **In re: Liquid Aluminum Sulfate Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: GEO Specialty Chemicals Inc., Kenneth A. Ghazey and Brian C. Steppig (collectively, the “GEO Defendants”)**The lawsuit is about the price of liquid aluminum sulfate and whether its manufactures conspired to fix, stabilize or maintain its price and allocated customers for the product. | **10-2-2018** | **For more information visit or write:**[**www.LiquidAluminumSulfate.com**](http://www.LiquidAluminumSulfate.com)**Jay B. Shapiro****Steams Weaver Miller Weissler Alhadeff &**  **Sitterson, P.A.****Museum Tower****150 West Flagler Street****Suite 2200****Miami, FL 33130** |
| **7-11-2018** | **17-CV-03955** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Nakooka, et al. v. Dollar Tree Stores, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that Dollar Tree has a policy that store employees must wear only green shirts and black pants, that this clothing constitutes a uniform under California law, and that Dollar Tree violated California law by failing to reimburse employees for the cost of this clothing. Based on this allegation, Plaintiffs assert claimsUnder; (1) California Labor Code section 2802; (2) Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order 7-2001, section 9(A); and (3) California Business and Professions Code section 17200, et seq. Based on these claims, Plaintiffs seek reimbursement for the cost of this clothing, penalties, and to enjoin Dollar Tree from engaging in these practices going forward. Plaintiffs sue on behalf of themselves and all other individuals allegedly similarly situated to them with respect to the claims asserted. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Randall B. Aiman-Smith****Reed W .L. Marcy****Hallie Von Rock****Carey A. James****Brent A. Robinson****Aiman-Smith & Marcy****7677 Oakport Street****Suite 1150****Oakland, California 94621****510 817-2711 (Ph.)****510 562-6830 (Fax)****ras@asmlawyers.com****rwlm@asmlawyers.com****hvr@asmlawyers.com****caj@asmlawyers.com****bar@asmlawyers.com** |
| **7-16-2018** | **15-CV-11775** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Machado v. Endurance International Group Holding, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Endurance International Group Holdings, Inc., Hari Ravichandfran and Tivanka Ellawala (collectively, “Defendants”)**This case involves Defendants’ representations concerning Endurance’s non-GAAP metrics, including: (a) subscriber count; (b) average revenue per subscriber; (c) products per subscriber; and (d) the number of subscribers paying $500 or more for Endurance’s products and services. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants touted these metrics to create an impression of future revenue growth, but in fact, certain of the metrics reported by Defendants were misstated and Defendants also omitted data necessary to render their statements not misleading. Among other things, the Third Amended Class Action Complaint (“TAC”) alleged that Defendants published materially false and misleading figures regarding certain non-GAAP metrics, which misled shareholders with respect to Endurance’s growth rate and growth potential. According to the TAC, the alleged misrepresentations proximately caused class member losses as the inaccuracy of the non-GAAP metrics became clear and the Company’s true growth rate and potential became known.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Glancy Prongay & Murray LLP****Attn: Lionel Z. Glancy****1925 Century Park East** **Suite 2100****Los Angeles, CA 90067** |
| **7-12-2018** | **17-CV-0012** | **(D. Utah)** | **Lentsch v. Vista Outdoor Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Vista Outdoor Inc. (“Vista”), Mark W. DeYoung, Stephen M. Nolan and Kelly T. Grindle (collectively, “Defendants”)**Lead Plaintiff claims in the Action are stated in the Second Amended Complaint dated 1-12-2018 (the “Complaint”). Lead Plaintiff alleged that some or all of the Defendants violated Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”). The Complaint alleged that Defendants violated the federal securities law by allegedly failing to make required disclosures about Vista’s operations and financial results, including the write-offs of recorded goodwill in Vista’s Outdoor Products segment announced by Vista in January 2017 and November 2017. | **10-31-2018** | **For more information call or visit:****1 888 558-9299 (Ph.)**[**www.vistaoutdoorsecuritiessettlement.com**](http://www.vistaoutdoorsecuritiessettlement.com) |
| **7-16-2018** | **17-CV-6286** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Al-Martin, et al. v. Luxe Valet, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that Defendant violated federal and state labor laws by misclassifying Valets as independent contractors and as a result; (1) failing to pay for “overtime” hours worked more than 40 in a week; (2) failing to pay minimum wage; and (3) failing to provide wage statements with each payment of wages compliant with New York Labor Law § 195(3).  | **8-1-2018** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Matthew J. Blit****Justin S. Clark****Levine & Blit, PLLC****350 Fifth Avenue****Suite 4020****New York, NY 10118****212 967-3000 (Ph.)****212 967-3010 (Fax)** |
| **7-17-2018** | **16-CV-048571** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Doe, et al. v. Health Care Service Corp. (“HCSC”)**Plaintiffs claimed that Defendant HCSC has violated and is violating legal duties it owes to health insurance plan participants and beneficiaries by improperly restricting the scope of their insurance coverage for the treatment of mental illness in Residential Treatment Centers. It previously did so by enforcing illegal plan exclusions for such coverage, and it did and is still doing so by adopting and applying improperly restrictive medical necessity guidelines. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****D. Brian Hufford****Jason S. Cowart****Zuckerman Spaeder LLP****399 Park Avenue, 14th Floor****New York, NY 10022****212 704-9600 (Ph.)****Caroline E. Reynolds****Zuckerman Spaeder LLP****1800 M Street NW****Washington, DC 20036****202 778-1800 (Ph.)** |
| **7-17-2018** | **16-CV-00783** | **(N.D. Tex.)** | **Cynthia A. Parmelee v. Santander Consumer USA Holdings Inc., Thomas G. Dundon, Jason Kulas, and Jennifer Davis (“Defendants”)**Plaintiff asserting claims against all Defendants under Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, and against the Individual Defendants under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. Among other things, the Complaint alleged that, in violation of generally accepted accounting principles and Santander’s own accounting policies, Defendants incorrectly identified loans held by Santander that should have been classified as troubled debt restructurings (“TDRs”), and incorrectly estimated the impairment rate on those TDRs. The Complaint alleged that, as a result of these accounting violations, Santander materially overstatedits net income, requiring Santander to restate its financial results for fiscal year 2014, fiscal year 2015, and each of the quarters within those years. The Complaint further alleged that the prices of Santander’s publicly-traded securities were artificially inflated as a result of Santander’s overstated financial results, and declined when the truth was revealed. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Glancy Prongay & Murray LLP****Jason L. Krajcer****1925 Century Park East****Suite 2100****Los Angeles, CA 90067****The Rosen Law Firm, P.A.****Jacob Goldberg****101 Greenwood Avenue****Suite 440****Jenkintown, PA 19056** |
| **7-17-2018** | **12-MD-02311****12-CV-00101** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation Wire Harness Cases (Direct Purchaser)****Re Defendants: Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Mitsubishi Electric US Holdings, Inc., and Mitsubishi Electric Automotive America, Inc. (the “Mitsubishi Electric Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants entered into a conspiracy to suppress and eliminate competition for Wire Harness Products by agreeing to rig bids for, and to raise, fix, stabilize, or maintain the prices of, WireHarness Products, in violation of federal antitrust laws. Plaintiffs further allege that because of the conspiracy, they and other direct purchasers of Wire Harness Products in the United States have been injured by paying more for those products than they would have paid in the absence of the alleged illegal conduct, and they seek recovery of treble damages, together with reimbursement of costs and an award of reasonable attorneys’ fees. | **11-8-2018** | **For more information visit, write or call:**[**www.autopartsantitrustlitigation.com**](http://www.autopartsantitrustlitigation.com)**Joseph C. Kohn****KOHN, SWIFT & GRAF, P.C.****1600 Market Street****Suite 2500****Philadelphia, PA 19103****215 238-1700 (Ph.)****Eugene A. Spector****SPECTOR ROSEMAN & KODROFF,** **P.C.****1818 Market Street****Suite 2500****Philadelphia, PA 19103****215 496-0300 (Ph.)** |
| **7-17-2018** | **17-CV-02836** | **(E.D. Mo.)** | **Kevin P. Etzkorn v. 3 Day Blinds, LLC**This lawsuit claims that 3 Day Blinds caused text messages to be sent to consumers’ cell phone between 10-27-2013 through the date of filing the cause of action on 10-27-2017. The lawsuit claims that 3 Day Blinds violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act because consumers did not provide prior express written consent to receive these text messages. | **10-22-2018** | **For more information write to:****Neil Smith****The Smith Law Firm, LLC****231 S. Bemiston Avenue****Suite 260****Clayton, MO 63105** |
| **7-17-2018** | **15-CV-00105** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Samantha Jones v. Abercrombie & Fitch Trading Co.** Plaintiff alleges that Defendants did not accurately record and pay Plaintiff and the Class Members for their hours worked. Defendants systematically, unlawfully and unilaterally failed to accurately record regular on-call hours and overtime hours generated by those on-call hours, worked by the Plaintiff and the Class Members on call in shifts, in order to avoid paying these employees the applicable regular and overtime compensation. As a result, Plaintiff and the Class Members forfeited hours worked as well as compensation for other hours worked at overtime rates, by regularly working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable overtime rates. Defendants’ uniform policy and practice to not pay Class Members for all hours worked on call in shifts is evidenced by Defendants’ business records. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Scott B. Cooper****The Cooper Law Firm, P.C.****2030 Main Street****Suite 1300****Irvine, CA 92614****949 724-9200 (Ph.)****949 724-9255 (Fax)****scott@cooper-firm.com** |
| **7-18-2018** | **15-CV-99711** | **(D. Del.)** | **Hurwitz v. Mullins, et al.** **Re Defendants: Scott W. Smith, W. Richard Anderson, Bruce W. McCullough, and Loren Singletary (the “VNR Defendants”) and Eric Mullins, Charles W. Adcock, Jonathan C. Farber, Townes G. Pressler, Jr., John Bailey, and Jonathan P. Carroll (the “LRE Defendants” and Collectively with the VNR Defendants, the “Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants, Vanguard, and Lighthouse Merger Sub, LLC ("Lighthouse Merger Sub"), asserting violations of sections 14(a) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act"), and U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") Rule 14a-9 promulgated thereunder, in connection with the acquisition of LRE by Vanguard and Lighthouse Merger Sub that was first announced on 4-20-2015 (the “Acquisition”). On 1-20-2016, the Court appointed Hurwitz and Lead Plaintiff, Robbins Arroyo LLP as Lead Counsel, and Cooch and Taylor, P.A. as Liaison Counsel for plaintiff. For more information see CAFA Notice dated 7-5-2018. | **12-14-2018** | **For more information visit:**[**www.LRREnergySecuritiesLitigation.com**](http://www.LRREnergySecuritiesLitigation.com) |
| **7-18-2018** | **15-CV-02705** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Ashkenazi v. Bloomingdale’s Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that Bloomingdale’s violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act by sending a marketing text message to persons’ cellular telephone numbers without first obtaining prior express consent.  | **12-5-2018** | **For more information write to:****Ari H. Marcus****Marcus & Zelman, LLC****1500 Allaire Avenue****Suite 101****Ocean, NJ 07712** |
| **7-18-2018** | **12-MD-02311****12-CV-00101** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Wire Harness System (Direct Purchasers)****Re Defendants: Furukawa Electric Co., Ltd. and American Furukawa, Inc. (together, “Furukawa”), and Defendants Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Mitsubishi Electric US Holdings, Inc., and Mitsubishi Electric Automotive America, Inc. (collectively, “Mitsubishi Electric”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants entered into a conspiracy to suppress and eliminate competition for Wire Harness Products by agreeing to rig bids for, and to raise, fix, stabilize, or maintain the prices of, WireHarness Products, in violation of federal antitrust laws. Plaintiffs further allege that because of the conspiracy, they and other direct purchasers of Wire Harness Products in the United States have been injured by paying more for those products than they would have paid in the absence of the alleged illegal conduct, and they seek recovery of treble damages, together with reimbursement of costs and an award of reasonable attorneys’ fees. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Steven A. Kanner****FREED KANNER LONDON**  **& MILLEN LLC****2201 Waukegan Road****Suite 130****Bannockburn, IL 60015****224 632-4500 (Ph.)** |
| **7-18-2018** | **14-CV-2657** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Roseman, et al. v. Bloomberg L.P.**The District Court has rescheduled the fairness hearing originally set for 10-26-2018. For more information see CAFA Notice dated 6-27-2018. | **10-15-2018** | **For more information write, call or visit:****Getman, Sweeney &**  **Dunn, PLLC****260 Fair Street****Kingston, NY 12401****845 255-9370 (Ph.)**[**www.getmansweeney.com**](http://www.getmansweeney.com) |
| **7-19-2018** | **17-MD-02792** | **(W.D. Okla.)** | **In re: Samsung Top-Load Washing Machine Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation****Re Defendants: Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., Best Buy Co., Inc., The Home Depot, Inc., Home Depot U.S.A., Inc., Lowe’s Home Centers, LLC and Sears Holdings Corporation**Plaintiffs allege that the Washers’ top can detach from the chassis during operation (“Top-Separation”), and that, in certain Washers, the Washer drain pump can break or detach (“Drain Pump Failure”). | **Not set yet**  | **For more information write to:****William B. Federman****FEDERMAN & SHERWOOD****10205 N. Pennsylvania Ave.****Oklahoma City, OK 73120** |
| **7-19-2018** | **16-CV-00333** | **(W.D. Wash.)** | **Hirsi v. The Hertz Corporation, et al.****Re Defendants: Hertz Transporting, Inc., Firefly Rent A Car, LLC, and DTG Operation, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants was required to pay a minimum wage of $15 per hour in 2014 and of $15.24 in 2015 to the members of the Settlement Class, but that it failed to do so. In the Complaint, the Plaintiff asserted causes of action for the losses suffered by the Settlement Class as the result of the alleged actions by the Defendants.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call fax or e-mail:****BADGLEY MULLINS TURNER****Duncan C. Turner****19929 Ballinger Way NE Suite 200****Seattle, WA 98155****206 621-6566 (Ph.)****206 621-9686 (Fax)****dturner@badgleymullins.com** |
| **7-20-2018** | **13-CV-01686** | **(D. Minn.)** | **West Virginia Pipe Trade Health & Welfare Fund, et al. v. Medtronic, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Medtronic, Inc., William A. Hawkins, Gary L. Ellis, Julie Bearcroft, and Martin Yahiro (Defendants)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by, among other things, engaging in a scheme and course of conduct to defraud the investing public regarding the Company’s clinical trial design and reporting of clinical data and the risks associated with the use of INFUSE Bone Graft (“Infuse”). Plaintiffs further allege that as a result of Defendants’ scheme, Medtronic publicly traded common stock traded at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****ROBBINS GELLER** **RUDMAN & DOWD LLP****ELLEN GUSIKOFF STEWART****655 West Broadway** **Suite 1900****San Diego, CA 92101****MOTLEY RICE LLC****CHRISTOPHER F. MORIARTY****28 Bridgeside Blvd.****Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464** |
| **7-20-2018** | **17-CV-02069** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **Ward v. Flagship Credit Acceptance, LLC**Plaintiff alleges that Flagship violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 when it called Plaintiff’s cellular telephone using an automatic telephone dialing system. Plaintiff alleges that Flagship was calling numbers searching for someone else and continued to call after Plaintiff informed Flagship it was calling the wrong number and asked it to stop. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Lemberg Law, LLC****43 Danbury Road Wilton, CT 06897** |
| **7-20-2018** | **17-CV-02025** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **Elkin v. Walter Investment Management Corp.**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements concerning stockholders’ equity value in WIMC and WIMC’s deferred tax asset balances. Lead Plaintiff further alleges that the price of WIMC common stock was artificially inflated as a result of Defendants’ allegedly false and misleading statements, and declined when the truth was alleged to have been revealed. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Glancy Prongay & Murray** **LLP****Attn: Leanne Heine Solish****1925 Century Park East Suite 2100****Los Angeles, CA 90067** |
| **7-20-2018** | **15-CV-09279** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Edwards v. Hearst Communications, Inc.**This lawsuit claims that Defendant violated Michigan’s Preservation of Personal Privacy Act, M.C.L. § 445.1712 (“VRPA”) by disclosing information related to its customers’ magazine subscriptions to third parties.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Scott A. Bursor****Bursor & Fisher PA****888 Seventh Avenue****New York, NY 10019** |
| **7-20-2018** | **9-MD-2081** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **In re: Blood Reagents Antitrust Litigation**The lawsuit asserts that, as a result of Defendants’ alleged conduct, the prices paid for Traditional Blood Reagents were higher than they otherwise would have been.  | **10-24-2018** | **For more information write or call:****Eugene A. Spector****Jeffrey J. Corrigan****Rachel E. Kopp****Jeffrey L. Spector****Len A. Fisher****SPECTOR ROSEMAN &** **KODROFF, P.C.****1818 Market St., Ste. 2500****Philadelphia, PA 19103****215 496-0300 (Ph.)** |
| **7-20-2018** | **13-CV-02311****13-CV-02703** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Air Conditioning Systems (End Payor)****Re Defendants: Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. and Mitsubishi Heavy Industries Climate Control, Inc. (together, “Mitsubishi”)**Plaintiff alleges that the Defendants were involved in a criminal conspiracy to price-fix and rig bids for Air Conditioning Systems. Plaintiffs and the members of the Classes had no means of obtaining any facts or information concerning any aspect of the Defendants’ dealings with OEMs or other direct purchasers, much less the fact that they and their co-conspirators had engaged in the combination and conspiracy alleged herein. | **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** |
| **7-20-2018** | **15-MD-02624** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Lenovo Adware Litigation**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Lenovo and Superfish agreed to install software called VisualDiscovery on some Lenovo laptop computers. Plaintiffs say the software slowed down the computers, invaded user privacy, and exposed users to security risks. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****STEPHANIE D. BIEHL** **COTCHETT, PITRE &**  **McCARTHY, LLP****San Francisco Airport** **Office Center****840 Malcolm Road****Suite 200****Burlingame, CA 94010****650 697-6000 (Ph.)****650 697-0577 (Fax)** |
| **7-21-2018** | **13-CV-01328** | **(W.D. Mich.)** | **Steven Verburg, et al. v. Waltman, Weinberg & Reis Co., L.P.A., et al.****Re Defendants: Weltman, Weinberg & Reis Co., L.P.A., LVNV Funding LLC, Midland Funding LLC, Midland Credit Management, Inc., and Encore Capital Group, Inc. (“Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated state and federal law by initiating garnishments against Michigan judgment debtors in which Defendants included in the stated amount of the judgment balance certain costs that Plaintiffs contend were not recoverable, or had not been determined to be recoverable at the time they were added to the judgment balance. Plaintiffs assert that such acts render Defendants liable for statutory damages under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act and for refunds and account adjustments under Michigan law. | **11-13-2018** | **For more information write to:****Phillip C. Rogers****6140 28th Street, S.E.****Suite 115****Grand Rapids, Michigan 49548** |
| **7-23-2018** | **16-CV-441** | **(S.D. Ohio)** | **In re: Mercy Health ERISA Litigation****Re Defendants: Mercy Health, The Mercy Health Retirement Plan Committee, and the Members of the Mercy Health Retirement Plan Committee (together, “Mercy” or “Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants denied the Plans’ participants and beneficiaries the protections of Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, 29 U.S.C. § 1001, et seq. (“ERISA”) by claiming the Plans were “church plans” that were exempt from ERISA. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write call or fax:****Mark P. Kindall****Douglas P. Needham****Izard, Kindall & Raabe LLP****29 South Main Street****Suite 305****West Hartford, CT 06107****860 493-6292 (Ph.)****860 493-6290 (Fax)** |
| **7-23-2018** | **18-CV-00274** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **Tashica Fulton-Green, et al. v. Accolade, Inc.**In the Lawsuit, Plaintiffs have brought claims against Accolade for; (1) breach of implied contract; (2) negligence; (3) negligence per se; and (4) breach of fiduciary duty, all related to the Data Disclosure. |  | **For more information write or call:****John A. Yanchunis****Morgan & Morgan Complex**  **Litigation Group****201 N Franklin Street****Tampa, FL 33602****855 400-3445 (Ph.)** |
| **7-24-2018** | **13-CV-04731** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Kimberly Roberts, Carneisha Forney and Laurie Mullen v. TJ Maxx of CA, LLC**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and Class Members for all minimum and overtime wages. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants’ written policies regarding “closing” procedures are unlawful, which makes the case amenable for class certification. Specifically, Plaintiffs’ allege that Defendants’ procedures ensure that Plaintiffs and Class Members are forced to remain under Defendants control after they are clocked out at the end of the day. Despite being “off-the-clock” Plaintiffs allege that they and Class Members are not permitted to leave for the night until their managers finish certain required tasks (such as setting alarms, locking doors, inspecting the store, and performing bag inspections.) As a result of its practice of paying by schedule, rather than actual time worked, Defendants also violated California Labor Code §204 (requiring employers to compensate employees correct and proper regular wages for all regular hours worked on regular paydays), and California Labor Code §§1197.1 and 1199 (imposing penalties and fines for failure to pay correct and proper wages for all hours worked). | **11-29-2018** | **For more information write to:****Marcus J. Bradley****Kiley L. Grombacher****Bradley Gromabacher LLP****2815 Townsgate Road** **Suite 130****Westlake Village, CA 91361****Shaun Setareh****Setareh Law Group****9454 Wilshire Boulevard****Suite 907****Los Angeles, CA 90212** |
| **7-25-2018** | **15-CV-03831** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Robert A. Pastor, Scott M. Van Horn, Regina M. Florence, William F. Florence, III v. Bank of America, N.A.**Plaintiffs allege that Bank of America (“BOA”) impermissibly accessed consumer credit reports to conduct Account Review Inquiries of BOA customers after their account relationships with BOA allegedly had ended. | **8-16-2018** | **For more information write to:****Joshua B. Swigart****David J. McGlothlin****HYDE & SWIGART** **2221 Camino Del Rio South Suite 101** **San Diego, CA 92108-3551** |
| **7-25-2018** | **16-CV-00580** | **(D. Oregon)** | **Ciuffitelli, et al. v. Deloitte & Touche LLP, et al.**Plaintiffs allege that Aequitas Securities were sold in violation of the Oregon Securities Laws because they; 1) were unregistered; and 2) were sold by means of facts regarding; a) undisclosed prior business failures; b) the use of investor funds and the inability to purchase receivables assets; c) undisclosed dependence on renewals of short-term notes; d) misleading asset valuations and various other misrepresentations. The lawsuit alleges that, as a result of these violations of Oregon Securities Laws, they and others investors lost hundreds of millions of dollars. The lawsuit further alleges that the Defendants together are responsible for the violations of the Oregon Securities laws. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Steve W. Berman****Karl P. Barth****HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL**  **SHAPIRO, LLP****1918 Eighth Avenue****Suite 3300****Seattle, WA 98101****206 623-7292 (Ph.)****AequitasSettlement@hbsslaw.com** |
| **7-25-2018** | **13-CV-01818** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Quality Systems, Inc. Securities Litigation****Re Defendants: Steven T. Plochocki, Paul Holt, and Sheldon Razin (the “Individual Defendants,” and together with QSI, Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that during the period between 5-26-2011 and 7-25-2012, inclusive (the “Class Period”), Defendants QSI, Steven T. Plochocki, Paul Holt and Sheldon Razin made materially false and misleading statements about QSI’s business performance and conditions. Specifically, Lead Plaintiffs allege that during the Class Period, Defendants misled investors regarding QSI’s sales opportunities (or “pipeline”), market demand for QSI’s products and QSI’s projected earnings growth. | **11-19-2018** | **For more information write to:****Robert R. Henssler Jr.****Robbins Geller Rudman** **& Dowd LLP****655 West Broadway****Suite 1900****San Diego CA 92101** |
| **7-26-2018** | **15-CV-2456****15-CV-2588** | **(E.D. Fla.)** | **Hargrett, et al. v. Amazon.com DEDC LLC****Austin, et al. v. Amazon DEDC LLC**Plaintiffs allege that Amazon’s Disclosure Form and its procurement of background check reports on the basis of that Form violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act (“FCRA”) because it contained unnecessary and confusing language. Based on these allegations, Plaintiffs seeks statutory damages. | **12-16-2018** | **For more information write or call:****Luis A. Cabassa****Brandon J. Hill****WENZEL FENTON CABASSA, P.A.****1110 North Florida Avenue Suite 300****Tampa, Florida 33602****813 224-0431 (Ph.)** |
| **7-26-2018** | **17-CV-01365** | **(D. Del.)** | **Bray, et al. v. GameStop Corp.**The lawsuit claims that GameStop was responsible for the Security Incident that occurred and asserts claims such as: negligence, negligence per se, breach of contract, breach of implied contract, unjust enrichment and violation of the Indiana and North Carolina consumer protection statutes. The lawsuit seeks compensation for people who had losses as a result of the Security Incident. | **10-25-2018** | **For more information write to:****Benjamin F. Johns** **Chimicles & Tikellis LLP, 361 W. Lancaster Avenue Haverford, PA 19041** **Cornelius P. Dukelow Abington Cole + Ellery****320 South Boston Avenue Suite 1130****Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103.** |
| **7-26-2018** | **15-MD-02599** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **In re: Takata Airbag Product Liability Litigation****Re Defendant: Ford Motor Company**The lawsuit alleges that certain automotive companies, including Ford, manufactured,distributed, or sold certain vehicles containing defective Takata airbaginflators manufactured by Defendants Takata Corporation and TK Holdings, Inc. that 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 thereof. The lawsuit claims violations of various state consumer protection statutes, among other claims. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****PODHURST ORSECK, P.A.****SunTrust International**  **Center****One S.E. 3rd Avenue****Suite 2700****Miami, Florida 33131****305 358-2800 (Ph.)****pprieto@podhurst.com**[**www.podhurst.com**](http://www.podhurst.com) **(URL)** |
| **7-27-2018** | **12-MD-02311** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation**Plaintiffs allege that they were injured as a result of Bosch’s alleged participation in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain and/or stabilize prices, rig bids, and allocate markets and customers for starters and alternators in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act and various state antirust, unfair completion, unjust enrichment, and consumer protection laws as set forth in Truck and Equipment Dealers First Amended Class Action Complaint.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Duane Morris LLP****30 South 17th Street****Philadelphia, PA 19103** |
| **7-30-2018** | **17-CV-05064** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Darius Rowser, et al. v. Trunk Club, Inc., et al.** Plaintiffs, former employees of Trunk Club, have brought a class action lawsuit in the United States District Court, Central District of California. Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all other hourly, non-exempt employees and/or commissioned employees who worked for Trunk Club, allege that Trunk Club failed to pay all minimum, regular, and overtime wages required under the federal Fair Labor Standards Act. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail****David Yeremian****Alvin B. Lindsay****David Yeremian &**  **Associates, Inc.****535 N. Brand Blvd****Suite 705****Glendale, CA 91203****818 230-8380 (Ph.)****Alvin@yeremianlaw.com****david@yeremianlaw.com** |
| **7-30-2018** | **16-CV-00210** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Jackson, et al. v. Wendy’s International, LLC**The lawsuit claims that Wendy’s was responsible for the Data Breach and asserts claims such as: breach of implied contract; negligence; violation of the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act; violation of the New York Business Law, N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law §§ 349 et seq.; violation of the Tennessee Consumer Protection, Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 47-18-101 et seq.; violation of the New Jersey Consumer Fraud Act; violation of the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices – Consumer Protection Act. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****John A. Yanchunis****Morgan & Morgan Complex** **Litigation Group****One Tampa City Center****201 N. Franklin Street****7th Floor****Tampa, FL 33602** |
| **7-30-2018** | **15-CV-04519** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Rebecca Rysewyk, Katie Smith and Brian Van Vooren v. Sears Holding Corporation and Sears, Roebuck and Company**The Plaintiffs contend that the Craftsman® Riding Lawn Tractors have certain defective parts in the fuel delivery system that are prone to become loose and/or leak fuel, i.e., the fuel tank grommet, clamps securing fuel lines, and fuel lines. The Plaintiffs have sought damages for themselves and other consumers (the “Class Members”) which included, among other things, the costs of repair or replacement of the alleged defective parts. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Edward A. Wallace****Andrew D. Welker** **Wexler Wallace, LLP****55 West Monroe Street****Suite 3300****Chicago, IL 60603****Gregory F. Coleman****Mark E. Silvey** **Greg Coleman Law, PC****800 S. Gay Street****Suite 1100****Knoxville, TN 37929** |
| **7-31-2018** | **12-MD-14097** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: T.RAD Co., Ltd. and T.RAD North America Inc. (collectively, “T.RAD”)**The lawsuit alleges that the Defendants agreed to unlawfully raise the price of certain motor vehicle Starters, Alternators, or Radiators. As a result, dealers of Trucks and/or Equipment who purchased for resale or lease new Trucks and/or Equipment containing those parts or who indirectly purchased those parts as separate parts, which were manufactured or sold by a Defendant or any subsidiary, affiliate, or alleged co-conspirator of a Defendant, allegedly paid more than they should have. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.TruckDealerSettlement.com**](http://www.TruckDealerSettlement.com) |