| **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **11-1-2018** | **16-CV-04911** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Karla Schroeder, et al. v. Envoy Air, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that Envoy violated the California Labor Code and provisions of the Industrial Welfare Commission’s Wage Order No. 9 when it (1) failed to provide meal and rest periods, (2) failed to provide adequate pay stubs, (3) failed to reimburse for expenses incurred, (4) failed to pay minimum and overtime wages, (5) violated the Los Angeles Living Wage Ordinance, (6) engaged in unfair competition under California Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq., (7) failed to produce employment records upon request pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226, (8) failed to produce employment records upon request pursuant to California Labor Code Section 1198.5, (9) failed to provide proper sick leave under California Labor Code §§ 233, 234, (10) and failed to pay wages upon termination pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 201-203.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****ALAN HARRIS****PRIYA MOHAN** **HARRIS & RUBLE****655 North Central Avenue 17th Floor****Glendale, CA 91203****323 962-3777 (Ph.)****323 962-3004 (Fax)****aharris@harrisandruble.com****pmohan@harrisandruble.com** |
| **11-2-2018** | **15-CV-08187** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Gutierrez v. Stericycle, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that Stericycle failed to pay all wages owed based on their time rounding and donning and doffing policies, did not include all bonuses in the overtime rate, failed to pay all vested vacation payments due, failed to provide statutory meal and rest periods and derivative claims for failure to provide accurate wage statements, waiting time penalties, Private Attorney General Act and unfair competition. The proposed classes are Stericycle’s non-exempt hourly employees in California during the period of 8-14-2010 to 9-18-2017. The complaint seeks damages, penalties, and interest. | **Not set yet**Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Kevin T. Barnes and Gregg Lander Law Offices of** **Kevin T. Barnes** **5670 Wilshire Boulevard Suite 1460****Los Angeles, CA 90036-5664** **323 549-9100 (Ph.)****323 549-0101 (Fax)****Barnes@kbarnes.com** |
| **11-2-2018** | **17-CV-02811** | **(D. Md.)** | **Amy Alloways, et al. v. The Cruise Web, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that the training period commission plan is not a bona fide commission plan under the law and, therefore, deprives them of overtime payments while they were in training. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****The Law Offices of** **Peter T. Nicholl****36 South Charles Street****Suite 1700****Baltimore, MD 21201****410 244-7500 (Ph.)** |
| **11-2-2018** | **15-CV-06314** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Abante Rooter and Plumbing, Inc., et al. v. Alarm.com Incorporated, et al.****Re Defendants: Alarm.com Incorporated and Alarm.com Holdings, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that Alarm.com’s dealer, Alliance Security, Inc., violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq. (“TCPA”) by making or retainingothers to make automated telemarketing calls promoting Alarm.com’s goods or services to cellular telephones, and making calls using an artificial or pre-recorded voice to a residential line, and calling telephone numbers registered on the National Do-Not-Call Registry without the prior permission from the people contacted. Under the TCPA, a person is entitled to receive $500 for calls that were placed using a prerecorded messages or automated telephone dialing system without the person’s consent. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call fax or e-mail:****Terrell Marshall Law Group****936 N. 34th Street****Suite 300****Seattle, Washington 98103****206 816-6603 (Ph.)****206 319-5450 (Fax)****info@terrellmarshall.com** |
| **11-5-2018** | **12-CV-05162** | **(W.D. Ark.)** | **City of Pontiac General Employee’s Retirement System v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated §§ 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchanges Act of 1934 by issuing materially false and misleading statements during the Class Period. Specifically, Lead Plaintiff alleges that the Company failed to disclose that its executives had allegedly been involved in a multi-million-dollar bribery scheme at Walmart’s Mexican subsidiary, Wal-Mart de Mexico, used to obtain building permits that fueled Walmart’s growth in Mexico. The Complaint further alleges that as a result of Defendants’ allegedly false statements, Walmart’s stock traded at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period, until the alleged misstatements were disclosed in an article published in The New York Times on 4-21-2012. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Robbins Geller****Rudman & Dowd LLP****Ellen Gusikoff Stewart****655 West Broadway****Suite 1900****San Diego, CA 92191** |
| **11-7-2018** | **15-CV-6369** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Investment Technology Group, Inc. Securities Litigation****Re Defendants: Investment Technology Group, Inc. (“ITG”) and Robert C. Gasser (together with ITG, “Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that ITG, Robert C. Gasser, and Steven Vigliotti for allegedly violating §§ 10(b) and 20(a) of the SecuritiesExchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder. On 10-15-2015, the Court appointed Metzler as Lead Plaintiff and Motley Rice as Lead Counsel pursuant to the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (the “PSLRA”). Thereafter, on 12-14-2015, Lead Plaintiff filed its Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint for Violations of the Federal Securities Laws against ITG, Gasser, Vigliotti, and Mats Goebels (“CAC”). The CAC alleged that, during the Class Period, these defendants failed to disclose a proprietary trading pilot project at ITG, called “Project Omega,” that was operating in connection with ITG’s alternative trading system, called POSIT. According to the CAC, ITG told shareholders and clients that their trades in POSIT were confidential and anonymous, and highlighted ITG’s reputation for independence, integrity, and POSIT’s confidentiality while not disclosing that Project Omega had accessed confidential customer data. Lead Plaintiff further alleged that, when ITG finally disclosed Project Omega, it was only in connection with a settlement and Consent Order with theU.S. Securities & Exchange Commission (“SEC”), under which the Company agreed to pay a $20 million fine, and that the price of ITG common stock declined following the announcement of that settlement, allegedly damaging the Class. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Gregg S. Levin****Lance V. Oliver****MOTLEY RICE LLC****28 Bridgeside Boulevard****Mount Pleasant, SC 29464****843 216-9000 (Ph.)****843 216-9450 (Fax)** |
| **11-8-2018** | **14-CV-03264** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Capacitors Antitrust Litigation – Indirect Purchaser****Re Defendants: Nichicon Corporation and Nichicon (America) Corporation (collectively, “Nichicon”)**The lawsuit alleges that Defendants and co-conspirators conspired to raise and fix the prices of Capacitors for more than ten years, resulting in overcharges to indirect purchasers of Capacitors. 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 Capacitors by, among other things, face-to-face meetings and other communications, customer allocation, and the use of trade associations. | **10-18-2018** | **For more information visit or call:**[**www.capacitorsindirectcase.com**](http://www.capacitorsindirectcase.com)**1-866-217-4245 (Ph.)** |
| **11-8-2018** | **10-CV-05135** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **Huffmann v. Prudential Insurance Company of America**Plaintiffs allege that Prudential’s use of Alliance Accounts to settle claims is unauthorized because the applicable insurance policies provide that benefits will be paid to the beneficiary in “one sum” unless the beneficiary requests another form of payment, and allege that the practice is unfair because Prudential keeps for itself most of the profits it earns investing the money owed to the beneficiaries. The Plaintiffs further allege that the practice is improper because Prudential controls how much income is receives from the practice and does not disclose this income to the Plans. The Plaintiffs allege that these practices violate a federal law, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, that requires persons who administer employee benefit plans to act in accordance with the plans’ terms and solely in the interests of the plans’ beneficiaries (“Count 1”), and prohibits plan administrators from earning compensation for their services unless certain requirements are met (“Count 2”). | **4-2-2019** | **For more information visit:**[**www.huffmanclassaction.com**](http://www.huffmanclassaction.com) |
| **11-8-2018** | **15-CV-2150** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Petti v. The Procter & Gamble Company (“P&G”**Plaintiff asserts that, although the packaging on the Freshmates wipes states that the wipes are “flushable,” “septic safe,” and “safe for sewer and septic systems,” the wipes are not suitable for disposal by flushing down atoilet, are not regarded as flushable by municipal sewage system operators, do not disperse upon flushing, and routinely damage or clog plumbing pipes, septic systems, and sewage lines and pumps. Plaintiff alleges that P&G is liable for: (a) violations of the California Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civil Code §1750 et seq., (b) false advertising in violation of CaliforniaBusiness and Professions Code §17500 et seq., (c) fraud, deceit and/or misrepresentation, (d) negligent misrepresentation, and (e) unfair, unlawful and deceptive trade practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code §17200 et seq. In the second lawsuit (Ramcharitar v. Procter & Gamble Company), the Plaintiffs make similar allegations regarding the Freshmates wipe and allege that P&G is liable for: (a) breach of express warranty, (b) negligent design, (c) negligent misrepresentation, (d) failure to warn, (e) violations of the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act, Florida Statutes §501.201 et seq., (f) unjust enrichment, (g) violation of the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, 15 U.S.C. §2301 et seq., (h) violation of the Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act, §805 Ill. Comp. Stat. §505 (2007), (i) tortious breach of warranty, and (j) fraud. Plaintiffs seek to pursue their claims on behalf of themselves and others who purchased the Product in the United States, except for purchases in New York. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Adam J. Gutride****Seth A. Safier****Kristen G. Simplicio****GUTRIDE SAFIER LLP****100 Pine Street****Suite 1250****San Francisco, CA 94111** |
| **11-8-2018** | **15-CV-02171** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Shaun Fauley v. Heska Corporation**Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C. §227 et seq. (the “TCPA”), by sending unsolicited advertisements by facsimile to members of the Class without their prior express invitation or permission and/or without specific opt-out language that Plaintiff contends was required. The TCPA provides that a recipient of a fax sent in violation of the Act may recover $500 per fax which the Court may treble it if finds the defendant knowingly or willfully violated the TCPA. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Anderson + Wanca****3701 Algonquin Road****Suite 500****Rolling Meadows, IL 60008** |
| **11-9-2018** | **15-CV-00231** | **(E.D. Wash.)** | **J. Mitchell Hall, et al. v. L-3 Communications Corporation, et al.****Re Defendants: L-3 Communications Corporation (known as L3 Technologies, Inc.), L-3 Vertex Aerospace LLC, and L-3 Communications Integrated Systems, L.P.**The lawsuit is a class action brought under the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Act (“USERRA”) and the Washington Law Against Discrimination. Plaintiffs allege that L-3 rejected Senior Pilot I application due to Plaintiffs military service or status in the National Guard, and that L-3 rejected Plaintiffs Senior Pilot I application due to Plaintiffs military service or status in the National Guard, and that L-3 had a pattern or practice of similarly denying members of the National Guard and Reserves Senior Pilot I positions due to their military service or status.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Outten & Golden LLP****Peter Romer-Friedman****601 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.****Second Floor West Suite****Washington, DC 20001****202 847-4400 (Ph.)****L3Settlement@outtengolden.com** |
| **11-9-2018** | **17-CV-284** | **(W.D. Mich.)** | **`****Pease v. Jackson National Life Insurance Co. (“JNL”)**Plaintiff alleges that JNL should not have selected and maintained the large number of JNL affiliated funds as investment options in the Plans, and that the Plans paid higher fees with respect to those investments than were reasonable. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Garrett W. Wotkyns** **John J. Nestico** **SCHNEIDER WALLACE COTTRELL KONECKY WOTKYNS, LLP** **8501 N. Scottsdale Rd.** **Suite 270** **Scottsdale, AZ 85253** |
| **11-12-2018** | **18-CV-00242** | **(D. Ariz.)** | **Jane V., et al. v. Motel 6 Operating L.P., et al.****Re Defendants: Motel 6 Operating L.P. and G6 Hospitality LLC doing dba Motel 6 (“Defendants”)**The lawsuit claims that Defendants violated federal and state law by providing their guest lists to Federal Immigration Authorities, including agents for the United States Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) and United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”).  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Thomas A. Saenz****Andrés R. Holguin-Flores****Mexican American Legal** **Defense and Educational Fund****634 S. Spring Street****11th Floor****Los Angeles, CA 90014** |
| **11-13-2018** | **16-MD-02752** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Yahoo! Inc., Customer Data Security Breach Litigation**The lawsuit was brought on behalf of the individuals impacted by the Data Breaches against Yahoo! Inc. and its small business services provider, Aabaco Small Business, LLC. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants failed to adequately protect their Personal Information and that they were injured as a result.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****John Yanchunis** **of Morgan & Morgan Complex** **Litigation Group****1800 John F. Kennedy Blvd. Suite 1401** **Philipdelphia, Pa 19103** |
| **11-14-2018** | **12-CV-00568** | **(E.D. Cal.)** | **Wilson, et al. v. Metals USA, Inc.**The lawsuit claims that the Panels contain an inherent design defect wherein the surface coating of the Panels deteriorates well before the warranted 25-year period. The lawsuit further claims that Metals USA, Inc. ("MUSA") is liable as Dura-Loc's successor-in-interest. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Richard D. Lambert****Stonebarger Law, APC****75 Iron Point Circle****Suite 145****Folsom, CA 95630** |
| **11-14-2018** | **16-CV-03402** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: KYB Corporation (“f/k/B” Kayaba Industry Co., Ltd.) and KYB Americas Corporation (together “KYB”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants and unnamed co-conspirators, manufacturers and/or suppliers of Shock Absorbers globally and in the United States, for engaging 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 Shock Absorbers. According to the United States Department of Justice (“DOJ”), Defendants’ conspiracy successfully targeted the long-struggling United States automotive industry, raising prices for car manufacturers and automobile dealers alike. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Cotchett, Pitre, &**  **McCarthy LLP****San Francisco Airport Office** **Center****840 Malcolm Road****Suite 200****Burlingame, CA 94010****Robins Kaplan LLP****399 Park Avenue****Suite 3600****New York, NY 10022** |
| **11-14-2018** | **12-MD-02311****13-CV-02203** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****In re: Automotive Fuel Injection System – End Payer Action****Re Defendants: Maruyasu Industries Co., Ltd. (“Maruyasu”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants and unnamed co-conspirators, manufacturers and/or suppliers of Fuel Injection Systems globally and in the United States, for engaging 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. According to the United States Department of Justice (“DOJ”), Defendants’ conspiracy successfully targeted the long-struggling United States automotive industry, raising prices for car manufacturers and consumers alike. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Steven N. Williams****Elizabeth Tran****Demetrius X. Lambrinos****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)****swilliams@cpmlegal.com****etran@cpmlegal.com****dlambrinos@cpmlegal.com** |
| **11-15-2018** | **11-MD-02262** | **(S.D.N.Y)** | **In re: Libor-Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Bank of America Corporation and Bank of America, N.A. (together, “Bank of America”)**Plaintiffs alleged that the banks’ alleged conduct manipulated Eurodollar Futures prices to artificial levels between 1-1-2003 and 5-31-2011. As a result, Exchange-Based Plaintiffs claim that they traded Eurodollar futures contracts at artificial price levels, paying more and/or receiving less than they would have absent Defendants’ manipulation of the U.S. Dollar LIBOR rate. The alleged manipulation of Defendants’ LIBOR submissions caused the Settlement Class to pay higher supracompetitive prices or receive lower infracompetitive prices for Eurodollar futures contracts and options on Eurodollar futures during the Settlement Class Period. Exchange-Based Plaintiffs brought claims under the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.,* and Commodity Exchange Act, 7 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.* (“CEA”), against the Defendants seeking money damages. The Court has written at least seven published opinions addressing various legal matters raised by the parties in this lawsuit.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****David E. Kovel** **Karen Lerner** **Thomas W. Elrod** **KIRBY MCINERNEY LLP** **825 Third Avenue****16th Floor** **New York, NY 10022****Christopher Lovell** **Gary S. Jacobson** **Jody R. Krisiloff** **LOVELL STEWART** **HALEBIAN JACOBSON LLP** **61 Broadway****Suite 501** **New York, NY 10006**  |
| **11-16-2018** | **14-CV-00421** | **(W.D. Wash.)** | **Kenneth Wright v. Lyft, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that Lyft violated three laws: the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 (the “TCPA”), the Washington Commercial Electronic Mail Act, RCW 19.190.010 *et seq.* (“CEMA”), and the Washington Consumer Protection Act, RCW 19.86.010 *et seq.* (“CPA”), by sending unsolicited text messages to the members of the settlement class. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Donald W. Heyrich****HKM Employment Attorneys LLP****600 Stewart Street****Suite 901****Seattle, WA 98101****Peter Stutheit****Stutheit Kalin LLC****1 SW Columbia Street****Suite 1850****Portland, OR 97258** |
| **11-16-2018** | **18-CV-00931** | **(N.D. Ohio)** | **Jennings v. Fairmount Santrol Holdings, Inc.****Re Defendants: Fairmount Santrol Holdings, Inc. (“Fairmount Santrol,” now known as Dison Merger Sub I, LLC), Jennifer D. Deckard, Matthew F. LeBaron, William E. Conway, Michael G. Fisch, Charles D. Fowler, Stephen J. Hadden, Michael C. Kearney, William P. Kelly, Michael E. Sand, and Lawrence N. Schultz (collectively, the “Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated securities laws in connection with a transaction whereby a merger sub merged in Fairmount Santrol, with Fairmount Santrol (now known as Bison Merger Sub I, LLC) continuing as the surviving corporation and a direct wholly owned subsidiary of Unimin Corporation (the “Merger”). Plaintiff further alleges that stockholders of Fairmount Santrol filed putative class actions against Fairmount Santrol and its directors in the U.S. District Courts for the Northern District of Ohio and for the District of Delaware. The lawsuits generally alleged that Fairmount Santrol and it directors committed disclosure violations under Section 14(a) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 14a-9 promulgated thereunder and that the individual defendants were liable as controlling persons under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. The lawsuits alleged that the proxy statement filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) in connection with the Merger was materially incomplete and misleading.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Daniel R. Karon****KARON LLC****The Hoyt Block Building Suite 200****700 West St. Clair Avenue****Cleveland, Ohio 44113****216 622-1851 (Ph.)****dkaron@karonllc.com** |
| **11-17-2018** | **15-CV-0382** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Resistors Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Panasonic Corporation and Panasonic Corporation of North America (the “Panasonic Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants participated in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, or stabilize the price of linear resistors at artificially high levels in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1 et seq. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Shana E. Scarlett** **Benjamin J. Siegel****715 Hearst Avenue****Suite 202****Berkeley, CA 94710****510 725-3000(Ph.)****510 725-3001 (Fax)****jefff@hbsslaw.com****shanas@hbsslaw.com****bens@hbsslaw.com** |
| **11-19-2018** | **16-CV-696** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Dental Supplies Antitrust Litigation**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants collectively account for between 80% - 90% of all sales of Dental Products in the United States. The case involves an alleged nationwide agreement between the Defendants and another distributor, Burkhart, not to compete on price for the sale of Dental Products. Plaintiffs alleged that the Defendants coordinated to fix gross margins for Dental Products, boycott certain rivals, and to limit the interfirm hiring or “poaching” of each other’s sales representatives. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Eric L. Cramer****Berger Montague PC****1818 Market Street****Suite 3600****Philadelphia, PA 19103** |
| **11-19-2018** | **16-CV-1947** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Sunil Sudunagunta v. Nantkwest, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: NantKwest, Inc. (“NantKwest”), Patrick Soon-Shiong, Richard Gomberg, Barry J. Simon, Steve Gorlin, Michael D. Blaszyk, Henry Ji, Richard Kusserow, John T. Potts, Jr., Robert Rosen, and John C. Thomas, Jr., (collectively, the “Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants made false and/or misleading statements, as well as failed to disclose material adverse facts about the Company’s business, operations, and prospects. Specifically, Defendants madefalse and/or misleading statements and/or failed to disclose: (1) that that the Company was improperly accounting for stock-based awards in violation of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (“GAAP”); (2) that the Company was conducting improper build-to-suit lease accounting in violation of GAAP; (3) that, as such, NantKwest issued financial statements in violation of GAAP; (4) that the Company lacked adequate internal controls over accounting and financial reporting; and (5) that, as a result of the foregoing, the Company’s financial statements, as well as Defendants’ statements about NantKwest’s business, operations, and prospects, were false and misleading and/or lacked a reasonable basis. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****POMERANTZ LLP****Ten South LaSalle Street****Suite 3505****Chicago, IL 60603****312 377-1181 (Ph.)** |
| **11-19-2018** | **16-CV-696** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Dental Supplies Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendant: Benco Dental Supply Company (collectively, “Benco”)**For information please see CAFA notice on page 14. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Eric L. Cramer****Berger Montague PC****1818 Market Street****Suite 3600****Philadelphia, PA 19103** |
| **11-19-2018** | **16-CV-1947** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Sudunagunta v. NantKewest, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Incorporated; Citigroup Global Markets Inc.; Jefferies LLC; Piper Jaffray & Co., MLV & Co., LLC (collectively, the “Underwriter Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that NantKwest, certain of its former officers and directors, and theunderwriters for NantKwest’s IPO made material misrepresentations in violation of theSecurities Act of 1933 in the Registration Statement for NantKwest’s 7-28-2015 IPO.Earlier complaints also alleged violations of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, for statements made in the Registration Statement and thereafter. (Also see CAFA Notice on page 14). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Joshua B. Silverman****Pomerantz LLP****Ten South LaSalle Street****Suite 3505****Chicago, IL 60603** |
| **11-19-2018** | **17-MD-02801** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Capacitors Antitrust Litigation (Indirect Purchaser)****Re Defendants: Panasonic Corporation, Panasonic Corporation of North America, SANYO Electric Co., Ltd., and SANYO North America Corporation (collectively, “Panasonic”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants and other co-conspirators agreed, combined, and conspired to inflate, fix, raise, maintain or artificially stabilize prices of electrolytic and film capacitors. The combination and conspiracy engaged in by defendants and other co-conspirators was in violation of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 1) and various state antitrust, consumer protection, and unfair competition laws. As a direct result of the anticompetitive and unlawful conduct alleged herein, Plaintiffs and the Classes paid artificially inflated prices for electrolytic and film capacitors during the respective Class Periods and have thereby suffered antitrust injury to their business or property. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Joseph W. Cotchett****Steven N. Williams****Elizabeth Tran****COTCHETT, PITRE &** **McCARTHY, LLP****840 Malcolm Road****Suite 200****Burlingame, CA 94010****650 697-6000 (Ph.)****650 697-0577 (Fax)****jcotchett@cpmlegal.com****swilliams@cpmlegal.com****etran@cpmlegal.com** |
| **11-19-2018** | **15-CV-03820** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Resistors Antitrust Litigation – Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs****Re Defendants: Kamaya Electric Co., Ltd. and Kamaya, Inc. (together, “Kamaya Defendants”) and Walsin Technology Corporation and Walsin Technology Corporation, U.S.A. (together, “Walsin Defendants”) (collectively, the “Settling Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleged that Defendants participated in an unlawful conspiracy to raise, fix, maintain, or stabilize the price of linear resistors at artificially high levels in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1 et seq. | **8-11-2019** | **For more information write to:****Hagens Berman Sobol** **Shapiro LLP****715 Hearst Avenue****Suite 202****Berkeley, CA 94710****Cohen Milstein Sellers &**  **Toll PLLC****1100 New York Avenue, N.W.****Suite 500, West Tower****Washington, DC 20005** |
| **11-19-2018** | **15-CV-03820** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Resistors Antitrust Litigation** **Re Defendants: ROHM Co., Ltd. and ROHM Semiconductor U.S.A., LLC (together, “ROHM”)**See CAFA Notice above. | **4-11-2019** | **For more information write to:****Hagens Berman Sobol** **Shapiro LLP****715 Hearst Avenue****Suite 202****Berkeley, CA 94710****Cohen Milstein Sellers &**  **Toll PLLC****1100 New York Avenue, N.W.****Suite 500, West Tower****Washington, DC 20005** |
| **11-20-2018** | **16-CV-1947** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Sunil Sudunagunta v. Nantkwest, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: NantKwest, Inc. (“NantKwest”), Patrick Soon-Shiong, Richard Gomberg, Barry J. Simon, Steve Gorlin, Michael D. Blaszyk, Henry Ji, Richard Kusserow, John T. Potts, Jr., Robert Rosen, and John C. Thomas, Jr., (collectively, the “Defendants”)**November 19 Letter inadvertently stated that there are no hearings currently scheduled in this action. That information should be corrected as follows: pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1715(b)(2), the Court has scheduled for December 12, 2018 at 10:00a.m. a hearing on the plaintiffs’ Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement and Notice to the Settlement Class.For more information see CAFA Notice on page 14 above.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****POMERANTZ LLP****Ten South LaSalle Street****Suite 3505****Chicago, IL 60603****312 377-1181 (Ph.)** |
| **11-20-2018** | **18-CV-00174** | **(S.D. Ohio)** | **Virginia Guiette v. U.S. Bank National Association** Plaintiff alleges that U.S. Bank violated the Telephone Protection Act, by using an automatic telephone dialing system and/or an artificial or prerecorded voice to call or text cell phones without the prior express consent of the recipients. | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.cafanotices.com**](http://www.cafanotices.com) |
| **11-20-2018** | **11-MD-2262** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Libor-Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Citigroup Inc. and Citibank, N.A. (together, “Citi”)**Plaintiffs allege that Citi and other defendants conspired to manipulate the US. Dollar London Interbank Offered Rate (“USD Libor”) in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. Bondholder Plaintiffs specifically alleged that Citi and other Defendants manipulated USD Libor between 8-1-2007 and 5-31-2010 (the “Class Period”) and that Bondholder Plaintiffs suffered monetary damages as a result. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Karen L. Morris****Patrick F. Morris****R.Michael Lindsey****Morris and Morris LLC****Counselors at Law****4023 Kennett Pike, No. 254****Wilmington, DE 19807****302 426-0400 (Ph.)****kmorris@morrisandmorrislaw.com****pmorris@morrisandmorrislaw.com****rmlindsey@morrisandmorrislaw.com** |
| **11-20-2018** | **16-CV-05263** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **FrontPoint Asian Event Driven Fund, L.P., et al. v. Citibank, N.A., et al.**Plaintiffs allege that Citi and other Defendants conspired to manipulate the Singapore Interbank Offered Rate (“SIBOR”) and the Singapore Swap Offer Rate (“SOR”) in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. Plaintiffs specifically alleged that Defendants conduct occurred during a period from 1-1-2007 through at least 12-31-2011 (the “Class Period”), and that Plaintiffs suffered monetary damages as a result. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Vincent Briganti****Geoffrey M. Horn****Lowey Dannenberg, P.C.****44 South Broadway****White Plains, NY 10601****914 997-0500 (Ph.)****vbriganti@lowey.com** |
| **11-21-2018** | **18-CV-21897** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Papa v. Grieco Ford Fort Lauderdale LLC**The lawsuit alleges that Grieco sent a prerecorded ringless voicemail and a text message to Plaintiff’s wireless telephone number about buying Plaintiff’s car without prior express written consent in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 (“TCPA”) and seeks actual and statutory damages under the TCPA on behalf of the named Plaintiff and a class of all individuals in the United States. | **5-13-2019** | **For more information call or visit:****1 844 551-1722 (Ph.)**[**www.GFTLTCPAsettlement.com**](http://www.GFTLTCPAsettlement.com) |
| **11-21-2018** | **10-CV-591****18-CV-1177** | **(N.D.N.Y.)** | **Matthew Roach, et al. v. T.L. Cannon Corp. et al.****Ashley Hicks, et al. v. T.L. Cannon Corp. et al.**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants conspired to engage in anticompetitive price fixing of interchange fees, and enforced rules and policies that hindered the introduction of competition that would reduce the interchange fees. | **2-22-2019** | **For more information write or e-mail:****Michael J. Lingle****Thomas & Solomon LLP****693 East Avenue****Rochester, NY 14607****mlingle@theemploymentattorneys.com** |
| **11-21-2018** | **16-CV-696** | **(E.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Dental Supplies Antitrust Litigation**Plaintiffs have alleged that the Defendants collectively account for between 80% - 90% of all sales of Dental Products in the United States. The case involves an alleged nationwide agreement between the Defendants and another distributor, Burkhart, not to compete on price for the sale of Dental Products. Plaintiffs alleged that the Defendants coordinated to fix gross margins for Dental Products, boycott certain rivals, and to limit the interfirm hiring or “poaching” of each other’s sales representatives. (For more information see page 14 above). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Eric L. Cramer****Berger Montague PC****1818 Market Street****Suite 3600****Philadelphia, PA 19103** |
| **11-23-2018** | **16-CV-00021** | **(M.D. Ga.)** | **Gunthert v. Bankers Standard Insurance Company**The lawsuit alleges that the Defendant violated Georgia law relating to how the Defendant should have determined how much money to pay in connection with certain homeowners’ claims for property damage. The lawsuit alleges that Defendant breached its insurance contracts with homeowners by (1) failing to assess whether certain homeowners’ property experienced a diminution in value resulting from fire, water, mold, or foundation/structural damage and (2) failing to pay for any such diminution in value. | **3-5-2019** | **For more information write to:****Kopelman Sitton Law** **Group, LLC****Richard Kopelman****5855 Sandy Springs Circle****Suite 300****Atlanta, GA 30328** |
| **11-26-2018** | **18-CV-00209** | **(D. Hi.** | **Joshua Bokelman, et al. v. FCH Enterprises, Inc.**The Lawsuit is a proposed class action lawsuit brought on behalf of U.S. residents who used a credit or debit card at FCH Restaurants between 11-23-2017 and 3-29-2018, during which time the Security Incident occurred. The Security Incident resulted in the potential exposure of payment card data from customers who used credit or debit cards at FCH Restaurants between 11-23-2017 and 3-29-2018. The potentially‐exposed information included credit card numbers, expiration dates and magnetic stripe security codes. No cardholder names, addresses, printed security codes or other cardholder financial or personal information was exposed in the Security Incident. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Gregory M. Nespole****Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP****270 Madison Avenue****New York, NY 10016****212 545‐4600 (Ph.)****Rachele R. Byrd****Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP****750 B Street****Suite 2770****San Diego, CA 92101****619 239‐4599 (Ph.)** |
| **11-26-2018** | **16-CV-05263** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: FrontPoint Asian Event Driven Fund, L.P., et al. v. Citibank, N.A., et al.****Re Defendants: JPMorgan Chase & Co. and JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. (collectively, “JPMorgan”)**This conspiracy to manipulate the prices of SIBOR- and SOR-based derivatives caused both Plaintiffs and members of the Class to be overcharged and underpaid in their SIBOR- and SOR-based derivatives transactions. Plaintiffs and members of the Class also were deprived of the ability to accurately price SIBOR- and SOR-based derivatives entered into during the Class Period and to accurately determine the settlement value of SIBOR- and SOR-based derivatives by reference to an accurate SIBOR and SOR. Plaintiffs and members of theClass thus received, during the term of their transactions and upon settlement, less in value than they would have received absent Defendants’ conspiracy and overt acts in furtherance of the conspiracy. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Vincent Briganti** **LOWEY DANNENBER&i, P.C.****44 South Broadway****Suite 1100****White Plains, N.Y. 10601****914 997-0500 (Ph.)** |
| **11-26-2018** | **16-CV-00768** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **James Knapp v. Art.com, Inc.**The Final Judgment resolves all claims asserted in this action and all the parties’ rights and liabilities with respect to this action. For more information see CAFA Notice dated 3-10-2017. | **11-5-2018** | **For more inforamtion write to:****SCHNEIDER WALLACE COTTRELL**  **KONECKY WOTKYNS LLP****Todd M. Schneider** **Jason H. Kim** **Kyle G. Bates****2000 Powell St, Suite 1400****Emeryville, California 94608** |
| **11-28-2018** | **17-CV-2365** | **(D. Kan.)** | **Schapker v. Waddell & Reed Financial, Inc. et al.****Re Defendants: The Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors of Waddell & Reed Financial, Inc., the Administrative Committee of the Waddell & Reed Financial, Inc. 401(k) and Thrift Plan, Alan W. Kosloff, Michael F. Morrissey, James M. Raines, Jerry W. Walton, Daniel P. Connealy, Sara L. Kircher, Mark S. Newman, Michael D. Strohm, John E. Sundeen Jr., Brent K. Bloss, Melissa A. Clouse, Christopher W. Rackers and Amy J. Scupham (collectively, “Defendants”)**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to prudently control Plan costs and failed prudently to manage the Plan’s investments in the best interest of Plan participants and beneficiaries, and thereby breach fiduciary duties to the Plan and its participant’s and beneficiaries under Subchapter I, Subtitle B, Part 4 of ERISA. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Foulston Siefkin LLP****Attn: Scott Nehrbass****9225 Indian Creek** **Parkway****#600****Overland Parki, KS 66210** |
| **11-29-2018** | **16-CV-00570** | **(E.D. Pa.)** | **Mauthe v. Versa Cardio, LLC**Plaintiff alleges that it received unsolicited fax advertisements from Defendant promoting its goods or services that did not contain a proper opt out notice. Plaintiff alleged that these faxes violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Elizabeth Ryan****John Roddy****BAILEY & GLASSER LLP****99 High Street****Suite 304****Boston, MA 02110** |
| **11-29-2018** | **13-CV-02811** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Sullivan, et al. v. Barclays PLC, et al.****Re Defendants: Citigroup Inc. and Citibank N.A. (together, “Citi”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants, during the Class Period, conspired to manipulate and manipulated Euribor and the prices of Euribor Products. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants did so by using several means of manipulation. For example, Plaintiffs allege that panel banks that made daily Euribor submissions to Thomson Reuters, falsely reported banks’ costs of borrowing in order to financially benefit their Euribor Products positions. Plaintiffs also allege that Defendants requested that other Defendants make false Euribor submissions on their behalf to benefit their Euribor Products positions. | **5-17-2019** | **For more information call or visit:****800 492-9154 (Ph.)**[**www.EuriborSettlement.com**](http://www.EuriborSettlement.com)**.** |
| **11-29-2018** | **13-CV-1966** | **(D. Del.)** | **Wright, et al. v. City of Wilmington, C.A.**Plaintiffs bring this class action on behalf of themselves, and a class of others similarly situated, against the City of Wilmington (“City”) for violations of their rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment caused directly by the Wilmington Police Department (“WPD”) policy and custom of handcuffing, transporting, searching, and imprisoning individuals based solely upon reasonable suspicion that a crime has been committed. The existence of this policy is not in dispute as the City has admitted that this is their policy and custom. The Supreme Court has previously determined that the handcuffing, transport, search, and imprisonment of individuals based only on reasonable suspicion is unconstitutional. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Stephen P. Norman** **The Norman Law Firm****30838 Vines Creek Road****Unit 3****Dagsboro, DE 19939****302 537-3788 (Ph.)****snorman@thenormanlawfirm.com** |
| **11-29-2018** | **12-CV-00302** | **(D. Utah)** | **Charles Roberts, et al. v. C.R. England, Inc., et al.**Plaintiffs claim that Defendants 1) provided false mileage and income representations to drivers in order to induce them into becoming lease-drivers, 2) failed to disclose material information regarding the lease-driver program, 3) violated certain laws prohibiting unfair business practices and untruthful advertising, and 4) sold a “business opportunity” without making the required registrations and disclosures. The lawsuit seeks money for damages Class Members allegedly suffered as a result. | **Not set yet** | **For more information call or visit:****877 242-2522 (Ph.)**[**WWW.CRENGLANDCLASSACTION.COM**](http://WWW.CRENGLANDCLASSACTION.COM) |
| **11-30-2018** | **15-CV-02253** | **(M.D. Pa.)** | **T. Jason Noye, et al. v. Yale Associates, Inc.**The lawsuit claimed that Defendant failed to comply with the federal Fair Credit Reporting Act by failing to provide required FCRA notices to Plaintiff and for maintaining a policy and practice of inaccurately reporting Pennsylvania summary offenses, a separate and less serious category of criminal offense, as misdemeanors. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****FRANCIS & MAILMAN, P.C.****1600 Market Street****25th Floor****Philadelphia, PA 19103** |
| **11-30-2018** | **16-CV-02816** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Shaw v. AMN Services, LLC, et al.**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated California law by failing to pay class members for all overtime hours worked and failing to provide class members with legally compliant meal and rest periods. On this basis, plaintiffs bring claims for unpaid wages, failure to provide meal and rest periods, inaccurate wage statements, and failure to maintain pay records, failure to pay final wages, unfair competition and civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”). | **Not set yet** | **For more informatin write or:****Joshua Konecky, Nathan** **SCHNEIDER WALLACE**  **COTTRELL KONECKY** **WOTKYNS LLP****2000 Powell Street Suite 1400****Emeryville, CA 94608****415 421-7100 (Ph.)** |
| **11-30-2018** | **17-CV-01971** | **(M.D. Fla.)** | **Williams v. Bluestem Brands, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that that Bluestem violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227, when calling consumers on their cellular telephones, via an automatic telephone dialing system, at wrong numbers—in that the subscriber to the telephone number called was different from the party that Bluestem was trying to reach. Bluestem denies the allegations, denies that it used an automatic telephone dialing system to place calls to class members, and denies that it violated the TCPA. The parties have agreed to a settlement. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or visit:****Michael L. Greenwald Greenwald Davidson Radbil PLLC 7601 N. Federal Highway****Suite A-230****Boca Raton, FL 33487**[**www.Bluestem.Settlement.com**](http://www.Bluestem.Settlement.com) |