| **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1-4-2019** | **13-CV-2970** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Smith, et al. v. Merck & Company, Inc.**  Plaintiffs alleged that: (i) Merck discriminated against the Class on the basis of their gender with respect to their compensation, in violation of Title VII and the EPA; (ii) Merck discriminated against the Class on the basis of their gender with respect to promotions, in violation of Title VII; (iii) Merck discriminated against the Class on the basis of pregnancy, including with respect to their pay and promotions, in violation of Title VII; (iv) Merck violated certain rights of the Class under the FMLA; and (v) Merck violated certain rights of the Class under ERISA. | **Not set yet** | **For more information 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)** |
| **1-7-2019** | **11-MD-02263** | **(D.N.H.)** | **In re: Dial Complete Marketing and Sales Litigation**  The lawsuit alleges that the Defendant violated certain laws in the marketing, advertising and sale of Dial Complete Foaming Liquid Hand Soap in the United States. The lawsuit centers around advertising for Dial Complete including use of the active ingredient triclosan and including that Dial Complete “Kills 99.99% of Germs\* (\*encountered in household settings)” and the use of the phrase “#1 Doctor Recommended\*\*” (\*\*Antibacterial Liquid Hand Wash)”, and the claim that it “Kills more germs than any other liquid hand soap”. | **5-29-2019**  Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more information visit:**  [**www.soapsettlement.com**](http://www.soapsettlement.com) |
| **1-7-2019** | **18-CV-00382** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Schofield, et al. v. Delta Air Lines, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that Defendant: (1) failure to provide compliant background check disclosures/authorizations under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. §1681b(b)(2)(A)); (2) failure to provide the Summary of Rights under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 1681d(a)(1) and 1681g(e)); (3) failure to provide compliant background check disclosures/authorizations under the California Investigative Consumer Reporting Agencies Act (Cal. Civil Code §§ 1786 et seq.); (4) failure to provide compliant background check disclosure/authorizations under the California Consumer Credit Reporting Agencies Act (Cal. Civil Code §§ 1785 et seq.); and (5) unfair competition in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq. The Action asserts claims for statutory penalties, civil penalties, punitive damages, injunctive relief, and costs of suite, interest, restitution, and reasonable attorneys’ fees. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or visit:**  **Shaun Setareh**  **Thomas Segal**  **Setareh Law Group**  **315 South Beverly Drive**  **Suite 315**  **Beverly Hills, CA 90212**  **310 888-7771 (Ph.)** |
| **1-7-2019** | **18-CV-23240** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Poirier v. Cubamax Travel, Inc.**  Plaintiff allege that Cubamax transmitted telemarketing text messages to cellular phone number in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. §227, et seq. | **5-23-2019** | **For more information write to:**  **Shamis & Gentile, P.A.**  **Andrew J.Shamis**  **14 NE 1st Ave.,Suite 400**  **Miami, Floria 33132** |
| **1-8-2019** | **14-CV-02066** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Michael J. Angley v. UTi Worldwide Inc., et al.**  **Re Defendants: Edward G. Feizinger, Eric W. Kirchner, and Richard G. Rodick (collectively, “Defendants”)**  Plaintiffs allege that UTi Defendants violated Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by materially misrepresenting the functionality and effectiveness of UTi’s new operating systems and significant problems caused by the new systems. Plaintiffs allege that these materially false or misleading statements created artificial inflation in the price of UTi common stock during the period 3-28-2013 through 2-25-2014, inclusive. Plaintiffs allege that the truth was revealed to the market on 2-26-2014 when UTi disclosed that its liquidity and capital resources had decreased significantly over the previous several quarters, primarily the result of four factors, including “recent invoicing delays, primarily in the U.S., in connection with implementing [UTi’s] new freight forwarding operating system and global financial system.” The price of UTi common stock dropped by 30% that day. | **2-26-2019** | **For more inforamtion write to:**  **William B. Federman**  **Brooke Murphy**  **Federman & Sherwood**  **10205 N. Pennsylvania Ave.**  **Oklahoma City, OK 73120** |
| **1-8-2019** | **18-CV-01308** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Adams v. NTT Data, Inc., et al.**  **Re Defendants: NTT Data Services, LLC, Dell Services, LLC, and Synergy Services, Inc., d/b/a Talent Wave (collectively “Defendants”)**  The lawsuit alleges that certain individuals who performed work for Defendants between 5-26-2014 and 6-1-2018 were not paid overtime compensation to which they were entitled, did not receive meal or rest breaks consistent with statutory requirements, and was not paid wages in a timely manner. The lawsuit also alleges violations of the California Fair Competition Law. Defendants deny these allegations and deny that the Class Members are entitled to overtime compensation or other compensation beyond the compensation they  have been paid, and the Court has not issued any ruling or opinion against the Defendants or in favor of the Plaintiffs with respect to any of the claims asserted in the lawsuit. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Sarah R. Schalman-Berger**  **Berger-Montague PC**  **1818 Market Street**  **Syite 3600**  **Philadelphia, PA 19103** |
| **1-9-2019** | **15-CV-10180** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Carver, et al. v. The Bank of New York Mellon, et al.**  **Re Defendants: Bank of New York Mellon and BNY Mellon, National Association (collectively “BNYM”)**  Plaintiffs allege that BNYM breached its fiduciary duties and engaged in prohibited transactions under ERISA in conducting foreign exchange transactional services in connection with BNYM ADRs. Specifically, these plaintiffs  alleged that BNYM breached its duties of prudence and loyalty under 29 U.S.C. §§ 1104 and 1109 of ERISA; engaged in self-interested prohibited transactions in violation of 29 U.S.C. §§ 1106(b) of ERISA; and caused the plans to engage in party-in-interestprohibited transactions in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 1106(a) of ERISA when BNYM, as the depositary for the BNYM ADRs, systematically deducted allegedly impermissible fees from dividends and/or cash distributions issued by  foreign companies and owed to ERISA Entity ADR holders in the form of a “spread,” or mark-up, above the price available to BNYM at the time of the transaction. Plaintiffs alleged that, as a result of this practice of adding a retained millions of dollars from cash distributions that should have gone to ERISA Entity ADR holders. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Heather McElroy**  **Ciresi Conlin LLP**  **225 S. 6th Street**  **Suite 4600**  **Minneapolis, MN 55402**  **J. Brian McTigue**  **McTigue Law LLP**  **4530 Wisconsin Ave. NW**  **Suite 300**  **Washington, DC 20016** |
| **1-10-2019** | **15-CV-1935** | **(D.D.C.)** | **Kinard, et al. v. East Capitol Family Rental, LP, et al.**  **Re Defendants: East Capitol Family Rental, LP and A&R Management, Inc.**  The Lawsuit alleges that Capitol Gateway violated federal laws in how, Capitol Gateway calculated and applied the utility allowances that go into tenants’ rent calculations. The utility allowance acts like a credit, lowering tenants’ rents because they have to pay for utilities like electric and water. The Lawsuit alleges that Capitol Gateway violated federal law by reducing the utility allowances without providing tenants with proper, advance notice or an opportunity to comment; failing to increase the utility allowances following utility rate increases of 10 percent or more; and providing utility allowances that are so low that they do not approximate the reasonable consumption costs of an energy-conservative household. The Plaintiffs allege that because of these mistakes by Capitol Gateway, tenant rents were higher and monthly utility reimbursement checks were lower than they should have been. | **4-10-2019** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:**  **Chinh Q. Le**  **Beth Mellen Harrison**  **Rachel Rintelmann**  **Legal Aid Society of the**  **District of Columbia**  **1331 H Street, N.W.**  **Suite 350**  **Washington, D.C. 20005**  **202 628-1161 (Ph.)**  [**bharrison@legalaiddc.org**](mailto:bharrison@legalaiddc.org) |
| **1-14-2019** | **16-CV-06467** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Meyer, et al. v. Concordia International Corp., et al.**  **Re Defendants: Concordia International Corp., Mark Thompson, and Adrian De Saldanha (collectively “Defendants”)**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated federal securities laws by making material misrepresentations or omissions concerning (i) the expanded sales force and promotional campaign for Concordia’s lead drug, Donnatal®’s insurance reimbursement status. The Amended Class Action Complaint for Violations of the Federal Securities Laws (the “Complaint”) alleges that the misstatements and/or omissions artificially inflated the price of Concordia securities, and that the share prices dropped in response to certain subsequent disclosures, revealing the truth. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Jacob A. Goldberg**  **The Rosen Law Firm, P.A.**  **101 Greenwood Avenue**  **Suite 440**  **Jenkintown, PA 19046**  **212 600-2817 (Ph.)**  **212 202-3827 (Fax)**  [**info@rosenlegal.com**](mailto:info@rosenlegal.com) |
| **1-15-2019** | **17-MD-02777** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Chrysler-Dodge-Jeep Ecodiesel Marketing, Sales Practices, and Products Liability Litigation**  **Re Defendants: Fiat Chrysler Automobiles N.V., FCA US LLC, VMMotori S.p.A., and VM North America, Inc. (collectively, “FCA”) and Robert Bosch GmbH and Robert Bosch LLC (collectively, “Bosch”)**  Plaintiffs allege that the Subject Vehicles were equipped with AECDs that caused the vehicles to emit significantly more pollutants than consumers reasonably expected, and more pollutants than were permitted under federal and state clean air laws. Plaintiffs further assert that the Defendants intentionally misled consumers about the qualities and characteristics of the Subject Vehicles. | **5-3-2019** | **For more information write or visit:**  **Elizabeth J. Cabraser**  **LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &**  **BERNSTEIN, LLP**  **275 Battery Street**  **29th Floor**  **San Francisco, CA 94111**  **Roland K. Tellis**  **BARON & BUDD, P.C.**  **15910 Ventura Boulevard Suite 1600**  **Encino, CA 91436**  [**https://www.ecodieselsettlement.com/**](https://www.ecodieselsettlement.com/) |
| **1-15-2019** | **17-CV-08173** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Salcedo, et al. v. Subaru of America, Inc., et al.**  **Re Defendants: SUBARU CORPORATION, a Japanese**  **Corporation (collectively “Defendants”)**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants Vehicles suffer from a design defect in some vehicles that can cause premature connecting rod and main bearing failure. The lawsuit alleges that Defendants have violated certain consumer statutes and breached certain warranties, and it seeks certification of a nationwide class of present and former purchasers and lessees of Settlement Class Vehicles to pursue these claims. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Matthew D. Schelkopf**  **Joseph B. Kenney**  **Sauder Schelkopf**  **555 Lancaster Avenue**  **Berwyn, Pennsylvania 19312** |
| **1-16-2019** | **16-MD-2687** | **(D.N.J.)** | **In re: Liquid Aluminum Sulfate Antitrust Litigation (Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs)**  **Re Defendants: Chemtrade Logistics Income Fund; General Chemical Corporation; General Chemical LLC; General Chemical Performance Products, LLC; Chemtrade Chemicals Corporation; Chemtrade Chemicals US LLC; and Chemtrade Solutions, LLC (collectively, the “Chemtrade Defendants”), and Kemira Chemicals, Inc. (“Kemira”)**  The Direct Purchaser Class Plaintiffs claim that Kemira and Chemtrade participated in a conspiracy – with other Defendants in the Action and unnamed co-conspirators – to allocate territories and/or not to compete for each other’s historical business by rigging bids, allocating customers and fixing, stabilizing, and maintaining the price of Alum sold in the United States from 1-1-1997 to at least 2-28-2011 in violation of the federal antitrust laws. The Direct Purchaser Class Plaintiffs allege that the claimed anticompetitive conduct resulted in artificially inflated prices for Alum. | **4-17-2019** | **For more information write to:**  **Counsel for Kemira**  **Jeffrey S. Cashdan**  **King & Spalding LLP**  **1180 Peachtree Street, NE**  **Atlanta, GA 30309**  **Counsel for Chemtrade**  **Steven A. Reiss**  **Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP**  **767 Fifth Avenue**  **New York, NY 10153-0119** |
| **1-16-2019** | **12-CV-00584** | **(D. Idaho)** | **Cayne v. Washington Trust Bank and West Sprague Avenue Holdings, LLC**  The lawsuit is about whether after the Club terminated the Membership Contracts on 10-31-2010, Defendants became obligated to refund any amount of the membership deposits paid by the class members to join the Club | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Springel & Fink LLP**  **10655 Park Rum Drive**  **Suite 275**  **Las Vegas, Nevada 89144** |
| **1-16-2019** | **15-CV-05340** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Lynn Slovin, et al. v. Sunrun Inc., a California Corporation, Clean Energy Experts, LLC, a California, LLC doing business as Solar America, and Does 1-5, inclusive (collectively, “Defendants”)**  The lawsuit alleges that Defendants made marketing calls to consumers. The lawsuit alleges that the Defendants violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act because some consumers did not agree to receive these calls, or because the calls were made using prerecorded messages. An automatic telephone dialing system. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **David C. Parisi**  **Suzanne Havens Beckman**  **PARISI & HAVENS LLP**  **212 Marine Street**  **Suite 100**  **Santa Monica, CA 90405**  **Yitzchak Lieberman**  **Grace Parasmo**  **PARASMO LIEBERMAN LAW**  **7400 Hollywood Boulevard #505**  **Los Angeles, CA 90046** |
| **1-16-2019** | **16-CV-03711** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: SSA Bonds Antitrust Litigation**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants, and their co-conspirators, entered into and engaged in a conspiracy in unreasonable restraint of trade in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. The conspiracy consisted of a continuing agreement, understanding, or concerted action between and among Defendants and their co-conspirators in furtherance of which Defendants fixed, maintained, or made artificial prices on SSA bonds. Defendants’ unlawful conduct was through mutual understandings, combinations, or agreements by, between, and among Defendants and other unnamed co-conspirators. Defendants’ conspiracy is a per se violation of the Sherman Act and is, in any event, an unreasonable and unlawful restraint of trade. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:**  **Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP**  **David W. Mitchell**  **Brian O. O’Mara**  **Carmen A. Medici**  **655 West Broadway**  **Suite 1900**  **San Diego, CA 92101**  **619 231-1058 (Ph.)**  **619 231-7423 (Fax)**  [**davidm@rgrdlaw.com**](mailto:davidm@rgrdlaw.com)  [**bormara@rgrdlaw.com**](mailto:bormara@rgrdlaw.com)  [**cmedici@rgrdlaw.com**](mailto:cmedici@rgrdlaw.com) |
| **1-17-2019** | **18-CV-00804** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **LaShannda Jones v. The Salvation Army**  Plaintiff alleges that The Salvation Army violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act: (1) by procuring background checks on employees and job applicants without providing a “stand alone” disclosure informing them that a background check would be procured for employment purposes and without obtaining a proper authorization to obtain the background  check; and (2) by failing to provide notice to employees and job applicants before taking adverse actions based on information in the background checks. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Brandon J. Hill**  **Wenzel Fenton Cabassa, P.A.**  **1110 North Florida Ave. Suite 300**  **Tampa, FL 33602** |
| **1-18-2019** | **13-CV-6147** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **Cynthia Hill, Gail Williams, Denice Inman, Vicki Gordon, Rolando Lopez, Taura Pate, Ellen Ennis, and Andrea Holly v. The City of New York, et al.**  **Re Defendants: Michael Bloomberg as Mayor of the City of New York Raymond Kelly, Police Commissioner Richard F. Napolitano, Charles F. Dowd, Michael V. Polito, Ijubomir Belusic, Francis Kelly, Donald Church, David Litchenstein, and Local 1549, District Council 37, AFSME, AFLCIO; and John and Jane Does 1-20 (said names being fictitious, the persons intended being those who aided and abetted the unlawful conduct of the named Defendants)**  Plaintiffs as Class Representative filed this action on behalf of themselves and other class members seeking to improve working conditions in the NYPD’s Communication Section.Plaintiffs sought to do this by brining claims alleging violations of their rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1981 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the New York State Human Rights Law, the New York City Human Rights Law, The Family Medical Leave Act (“FMLA”), 29 U.S.C. §§ 2601, et seq., the New York State Public Employees’ Fair Employment Act of 1967, the New York Civil Service Law, § 200 et seq. (the “Taylor Law”), the New York City Collective Bargaining Law, and New York Labor Law § 162. Specifically, Plaintiffs complain that, starting in 5-2013, City Defendants have discriminated against them based on their race by cancelling sick leave, mandating overtime, and subjecting them to unfair discipline and that City Defendants have interfered with their ability to request and use approved FMLA leave or retaliated against them for doing so. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Maduegbuna Cooper LLP**  **30 Wall Street**  **8th Floor**  **New York, New York 10005**  **212 232-0155 (Ph.)** |
| **1-18-2019** | **14-CV-03074** | **(D. Cal.)** | **Morgan A. Taylor v. Professional Placement Services, LLC and Kohl’s Department Stores, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that PPS directed prerecorded "direct-to-voicemail" messages to cellular telephone numbers related to consumer debts in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. § 227(b ). Plaintiff alleges the contacts were telephone calls made using technology that automatically places voice mail messages on cellular telephones without the cell phone ever ringing. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Alexander H. Burke**  **Burke Law Offices, LLC**  **155 N. Michigan Ave. Ste. 9020**  **Chicago, IL 60601** |
| **1-18-2019** | **14-CV-03074** | **(D. Colo.)** | **Beltran, et al. InterExchange, Inc., et al.**  **Re Defendants: Cultural Care, Inc. d/b/a Cultural Care Au Pair**  As part of the au pair program, certain companies sponsor au pairs to live and work in the United States on J-1 visas. This lawsuit is about whether those Sponsors conspired to fix the au pair stipend at $195.75 per week, and whether they violated federal, state, and/or local laws in doing so. | **7-18-2019** | **For more information visit:**  [**http://www.aupairclassaction.com/**](http://www.aupairclassaction.com/) |
| **1-18-2019** | **14-CV-03624** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Gary Mednick, et al. v. Precor Inc.**  The lawsuit claims that Precor violated Illinois and federal laws by failing to disclose certain limitation on the efficacy of heart rate handle systems on the Treadmills. | **6-12-2019** | **For more information write to:**  **Katrina Carroll**  **Lite DePalma Greenberg**  **111 W. Washington**  **Suite 1240**  **Chicago, IL 60602** |
| **1-18-2019** | **16-CV-08637** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **In re: Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendant: Fieldale Farms Corporation (“Fieldale”)**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendants established, maintained or used a monopoly, or attempted to establish a monopoly, of trade or commerce in the market for Broilers, for the purpose of excluding competition or controlling, fixing or maintaining prices at a level higher than the completive market level, beginning at lease as early as 2000 and continuing through the date of this filing. It is further alleged that Defendants and their co-conspirators have been unjustly enriched as a result of their wrongful conduct and by Defendants’ unfair competition. Plaintiffs and members of the Class are accordingly entitled to equitable relief including restitution and/or disgorgement of all revenues, earnings, profits, compensation and benefits that may have been obtained by Defendants as a result of such business practices. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Kenneth A. Wexler**  **Thomas A. Doyle**  **Wexler Wallace LLP**  **55 W. Monroe Street**  **Suite 3300**  **Chicago, IL 60603**  **312 346-2222 (Ph.)** |
| **1-22-2019** | **17-CV-05771** | **(W.D. Wash.)** | **Anthony James Leo v. Appfolio, Inc.**  Plaintiff alleges that AppFolio violated  the federal Fair Credit Reporting Act (or “FCRA”) by (i) selling tenant screening reports that included public records that did not belong to the subject of the report, and (ii) not providing consumers with certain disclosures of information upon request that Plaintiff asserts are required under the FCRA. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Elizabeth A. Adams**  **Terrell Marshall Law**  **Group PLLC**  **936 North 34th Street**  **Suite 300**  **Seattle, Washington 98103**  **206 816-6603 (Ph.)** |
| **1-23-2019** | **16-CV-00212** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: The Bank of New York Mellon ADR FX Litigation (“BNYM”)**  Lead Plaintiffs allege that, during the relevant time period, BNYM systematically deducted impermissible fees for conducting foreign exchange from cash distributions issued by foreign companies, and owed to ADR holders. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Sharan Nirmul**  **Kessler Topaz Meltzer**  **& Check, LLP**  **280 King of Prussia Road**  **Radnor, PA 19087** |
| **1-25-2019** | **16-CV-1044**  **18-CV-00722** | **(M.D.N.C.)** | **Clark, et al. v. Duke University, et al.**  **Lucas, et al. v. Duke University**  Plaintiffs allege that during the Class Period, the defendants violated the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”), as amended, 29 U.S.C. 1001, et seq., with respect their management, operation and administration of the Plan. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Schlichter, Bogard & Denton**  **Attn: Duke 403(b) Settlement**  **100 S. Fourth Street**  **Suite 1200**  **St. Louis, MO 63102** |
| **1-25-2019** | **16-CV-1044**  **18-CV-00722** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation, Exhaust Systems (Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs)**  **Re Defendants: Faurecia Emissions Control Technologies, USA, LLC and Faurecia Exhaust Systems, Inc., (collectively, “Faurecia”)**  Plaintiffs allege the Defendants and their coconspirators — United States and global manufacturers and suppliers of Automotive Exhaust Systems — violated the antitrust laws by entering into a continuing conspiracy to rig bids and fix, raise, maintain, or stabilize prices of Automotive Exhaust Systems sold in the United States and elsewhere at supra-competitive levels. As a result of this unlawful conduct, Plaintiffs and other Class members paid artificially inflated prices for Automotive Exhaust Systems and have suffered antitrust injury to their business or property. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:**  **David H. Fink**  **Darryl Bressack**  **FINK + ASSOCIATES LAW**  **38500 Woodward Avenue**  **Suite 350**  **Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304**  **248 971-2500 (Ph.)**  [**dfink@finkandassociateslaw.com**](mailto:dfink@finkandassociateslaw.com)  [**dbressack@finkandassociateslaw.com**](mailto:dbressack@finkandassociateslaw.com) |
| **1-25-2019** | **17-CV-08758** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Saenz v. Lowe’s Home Center, LLC**  Plaintiff alleges that Lowe’s failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements as required under California Labor Code § 226 (“Section 226”). Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that Lowe’s wage statements failed to include “all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee,” among other things. Plaintiff purports to represent all current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Lowe’s in California for the period between 11-1-2016 and the present. Pursuant to Section 226, Plaintiff seeks to recover fees, and costs. Based on the same factual allegations, Plaintiff also asserts a cause of action pursuant to the California Labor Code Privacy Attorneys General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. § 2698, et seq. (“PAGA”), seeking civil penalties on behalf of allegedly “aggrieved” employees. | **Not set yet** | **For more informatio write to:**  **Samuel A. Wong**  **Samantha A. Smith**  **AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC**  **9811 Irvine Center Drive Suite 100**  **Irvine, California 92618** |
| **1-28-2019** | **15-CV-02190** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Zaklit, et al. v. Nationstar Mortgage LLC**  Plaintiffs allege that Defendant violated a California law by recording telephone calls to individuals’ mobile phones without their consent. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:**  **Todd M. Friedman**  **Adrian R. Bacon**  **Law Offices of**  **Todd M. Friedman, P.C.**  **21550 Oxnard St, Suite 780**  **Woodland Hills, CA 91367**  **877 619-8966 (Ph.)** |
| **1-28-2019** | **15-CV-02057** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Ahmed, et al. v. HSBC Bank USA, N.A., et al.**  This lawsuit claims that that PHH Mortgage Corporation and HSBC Bank USA, N.A. (“Defendants”), violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C.  § 227, by (a) using an automatic telephone dialing system to call cell phones (“Automatic Calls”) without proper consent, or (b) using an artificial or prerecorded voice (“Prerecorded Calls”). | **12-5-19** | **For more information write to:**  **Beth E. Terrell**  **Adrienne McEntee**  **Terrell Marshall Law**  **Group PLLC**  **936 North 34th Street**  **Suite 300**  **Seattle, WA 98103-8869** |
| **1-31-2019** | **17-CV-1825** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Coffeng, et al. v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc.**  Plaintiffs allege that there was a defect that caused some primary engine water pumps to fail, sometimes requiring repair or replacement. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants fraudulently, intentionally, negligently and/or recklessly concealed that the defects in class engines even though the Defendants knew or should have known of design and manufacturing defects in Class Vehicles if the Defendants had adequately tested class engines. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:**  **Gary S. Graifman**  **Kantrowitz, Goldhamer**  **& Graifman, P.C.**  **747 Chestnut Ridge Road**  **Chestnut Ridge, NY 10977** |
| **1-31-2019** | **13-MD-02420** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litigation**  **Re Defendant: Toshiba Corporation (“Toshiba”)**  The lawsuit alleges that Defendants and co-conspirators conspired to raise and fix the prices of cylindrical Li-Ion Cells for over ten years, resulting in overcharges to consumers and others who bought portable computers, camcorders, and power tools containing Li-Ion Cylindrical Batteries. The complaint describes how the Defendants and co-conspirators allegedly violated the U.S. and state antitrust, unfair competition, and consumer protection laws by agreeing to fix prices and restrict output of these cells by, among other things, face-to-face meetings and other communications, customer allocation, and the use of trade associations. | **7-16-2019** | **For more information write or e-mail:**  **Adam J. Zapala**  **Cotchett, Pitre**  **& McCarthy, LLP**  **840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200**  **Burlingame, CA 94010**  [**batteries@cpmlegal.com**](mailto:batteries@cpmlegal.com)  **Jeff Friedman**  **Hagens Berman Sobol**  **Shapiro LLP**  **715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 202**  **Berkeley, CA 94710**  [**batteries@hbsslaw.com**](mailto:batteries@hbsslaw.com) |
| **1-31-2019** | **16-CV-0799** | **(M.D. Tenn.)** | **Doe, et al. v. Hommrich, et al.**  **Re Defendants: Bonnie Hommrich, the Tennessee Department of the Children’s Services, and Rutherford County, Tennessee**  Plaintiffs allege that the Rutherford County Juvenile Detention Center was improperly holding detainees in “solitary confinement” or isolation as a form of punishment or discipline, and that the practice amounted to cruel and unusual punishment that is unconstitutional. The lawsuit also alleged that the Tennessee Department of Children’s Services (DCS) participated in decisions affecting detainees housed at the center and elsewhere and that DCS failed to take any action in order to prevent placement of detainees into “solitary confinement.” | **6-10-2019** | **For more information call or e-mail:**  **Thomas H. Castelli**  **Legal Director, ACLU Foundation of Tennessee**  **615 320-7142 (Ph.)**  [**tcastelli@aclu-tn.org**](mailto:tcastelli@aclu-tn.org)  **Mark J. Downton**  **Wesley B. Clark**  **615 984-4681 (Ph.)**  [**mark@downtonclark.com**](mailto:mark@downtonclark.com)  [**wesley@downtonclark.com**](mailto:wesley@downtonclark.com) |