


FRT Antitrust

As part of FRT Antitrust, clients receive notifications when new cases are added and significant milestones, such as settlement, are reached.

		FRT Antitrust Preliminary Alert May 11, 2016							
PRELIMINARY ALERT: ANTITRUST RECOVERY OPPORTUNITY									
Date of Alert: May 11, 2016 Case: Alaska Electrical Pension Fund v. Bank of America Corp. et al. ("ISDAfix") Settlement Amount: \$324 million Court: US District Court - Southern District of New York Claims: Federal antitrust violations; Commodity Exchange Act; unjust enrichment									
Summary of Matter FRT was recently notified of a partial settlement in the above referenced class action related to alleged rigging of the "ISDAfix", the benchmark rate used to set the terms for swap transactions. This Alert serves as preliminary notice of this potential recovery opportunity. Once a claim form and filing deadline have been established, FRT will send you a Full Alert with additional details. Defendants in this case include the banks listed below, along with ICAP PLC, the interdealer broker tasked with the daily setting of the U.S. dollar-rate version of ISDAfix. The settlement class is presently defined as "all Persons or entities who entered into, received or made payments on, terminated, transacted in, or held an ISDAfix Instrument during the Settlement Class Period," defendants and their affiliates excluded. The settlement has yet to be approved by the court, preliminarily or otherwise.		<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <th style="background-color: #2e3192; color: white;">Counsel Information</th> </tr> <tr> <td> Class Counsel: Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP Scott + Scott LLP Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP </td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <th style="background-color: #2e3192; color: white;">Covered Instruments</th> </tr> <tr> <td>ISDAfix Instruments (see below)</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <th style="background-color: #2e3192; color: white;">Important Dates</th> </tr> <tr> <td> Relevant Period: Jan. 1, 2006 – Jan. 31, 2014 Opt-out Deadline: To be determined Claim Filing Deadline: To be determined </td> </tr> </table>		Counsel Information	Class Counsel: Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP Scott + Scott LLP Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP	Covered Instruments	ISDAfix Instruments (see below)	Important Dates	Relevant Period: Jan. 1, 2006 – Jan. 31, 2014 Opt-out Deadline: To be determined Claim Filing Deadline: To be determined
Counsel Information									
Class Counsel: Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP Scott + Scott LLP Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP									
Covered Instruments									
ISDAfix Instruments (see below)									
Important Dates									
Relevant Period: Jan. 1, 2006 – Jan. 31, 2014 Opt-out Deadline: To be determined Claim Filing Deadline: To be determined									
<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <th style="background-color: #2e3192; color: white;">Next Steps</th> </tr> <tr> <td> You are receiving this Alert because you may be eligible to recover funds from this settlement at some future date. Please note that your current Service Agreement may not expressly cover antitrust cases. Upon receipt of instructions from you to assist in this matter – or to assist in all such matters – FRT will provide FRT Antitrust services subject to the same contingency fee arrangement in your Service Agreement. If you would like assistance in this matter, or to learn more about the FRT Antitrust program, please contact your FRT Representative. </td> </tr> </table>		Next Steps	You are receiving this Alert because you may be eligible to recover funds from this settlement at some future date. Please note that your current Service Agreement may not expressly cover antitrust cases. Upon receipt of instructions from you to assist in this matter – or to assist in all such matters – FRT will provide FRT Antitrust services subject to the same contingency fee arrangement in your Service Agreement. If you would like assistance in this matter, or to learn more about the FRT Antitrust program, please contact your FRT Representative.						
Next Steps									
You are receiving this Alert because you may be eligible to recover funds from this settlement at some future date. Please note that your current Service Agreement may not expressly cover antitrust cases. Upon receipt of instructions from you to assist in this matter – or to assist in all such matters – FRT will provide FRT Antitrust services subject to the same contingency fee arrangement in your Service Agreement. If you would like assistance in this matter, or to learn more about the FRT Antitrust program, please contact your FRT Representative.									
<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <th style="background-color: #2e3192; color: white;">Additional Information</th> </tr> <tr> <td> 1. What is this case about? This case concerns an investigation into manipulation of the ISDAfix benchmark rate, which is used to set the rate for interest rate derivative products. As of May 3, 2016, seven banks have agreed to a pay a total of \$342 million to settle the class action. Several defendants have yet to settle. The Complaint filed September 4, 2014 alleges that the defendant banks conspired together with interdealer broker ICAP PLC, which was responsible for managing the daily setting of the U.S. dollar-rate version of the ISDAfix, to manipulate the ISDAfix to the financial detriment of those purchasing or selling ISDAfix referenced financial products. According to a recent Law360 article¹, [t]he banks were responsible for submitting rate quotes, which ICAP essentially compiled. But the suit says the parties worked together to set the rate at the point where it was most profitable to them, including engaging in a process known in the industry as "banging the close" where they bought and sold derivative products just before the fix was closed in order to get the price they wanted. Specifically, the Complaint alleges: (1) conspiracy to restrain trade in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act; (2) manipulation in violation of the Commodity Exchange Act; (3) principal-agent liability in violation of Section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act; (4) aiding and abetting liability in violation of Section 22 of the Commodity Exchange Act; and (5) unjust enrichment. </td> </tr> </table>		Additional Information	1. What is this case about? This case concerns an investigation into manipulation of the ISDAfix benchmark rate, which is used to set the rate for interest rate derivative products. As of May 3, 2016, seven banks have agreed to a pay a total of \$342 million to settle the class action. Several defendants have yet to settle. The Complaint filed September 4, 2014 alleges that the defendant banks conspired together with interdealer broker ICAP PLC, which was responsible for managing the daily setting of the U.S. dollar-rate version of the ISDAfix, to manipulate the ISDAfix to the financial detriment of those purchasing or selling ISDAfix referenced financial products. According to a recent Law360 article ¹ , [t]he banks were responsible for submitting rate quotes, which ICAP essentially compiled. But the suit says the parties worked together to set the rate at the point where it was most profitable to them, including engaging in a process known in the industry as "banging the close" where they bought and sold derivative products just before the fix was closed in order to get the price they wanted. Specifically, the Complaint alleges: (1) conspiracy to restrain trade in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act; (2) manipulation in violation of the Commodity Exchange Act; (3) principal-agent liability in violation of Section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act; (4) aiding and abetting liability in violation of Section 22 of the Commodity Exchange Act; and (5) unjust enrichment.						
Additional Information									
1. What is this case about? This case concerns an investigation into manipulation of the ISDAfix benchmark rate, which is used to set the rate for interest rate derivative products. As of May 3, 2016, seven banks have agreed to a pay a total of \$342 million to settle the class action. Several defendants have yet to settle. The Complaint filed September 4, 2014 alleges that the defendant banks conspired together with interdealer broker ICAP PLC, which was responsible for managing the daily setting of the U.S. dollar-rate version of the ISDAfix, to manipulate the ISDAfix to the financial detriment of those purchasing or selling ISDAfix referenced financial products. According to a recent Law360 article ¹ , [t]he banks were responsible for submitting rate quotes, which ICAP essentially compiled. But the suit says the parties worked together to set the rate at the point where it was most profitable to them, including engaging in a process known in the industry as "banging the close" where they bought and sold derivative products just before the fix was closed in order to get the price they wanted. Specifically, the Complaint alleges: (1) conspiracy to restrain trade in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act; (2) manipulation in violation of the Commodity Exchange Act; (3) principal-agent liability in violation of Section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act; (4) aiding and abetting liability in violation of Section 22 of the Commodity Exchange Act; and (5) unjust enrichment.									

Receive notifications when new cases are added and significant milestones are reached:

- **Preliminary Alerts:** Alert clients that the case has settled and recovery opportunities will be forthcoming.
- **Full Alerts:** Alert clients that the recovery opportunity is available, plan of distribution has been finalized and client should consider taking some sort of action.

Quickly access high level case information including name of case, settlement amount, court in which the case is proceeding, and the legal theories under which the claim is being brought.

Summary of Matter: Provides additional details on the type of notice, known case information and details about the class definition.

Counsel Information: View partners involved to quickly scan for known counsel to help understand the strength of the case, known claims administrator, and 3rd party data providers for preliminary assessment purposes.

Covered Instruments: Determine which instruments are included within the recovery opportunity. Antitrust cases often involve complex financial instruments or contracts not tied to a security identifier, therefore it's critical to understand the covered instruments to determine eligibility for recovery and weight the costs / benefits of getting involved.

Important Dates: View relevant periods for trades in covered instruments, opt-out deadlines for firms with outsized losses and claims filing and data submission deadlines for recovery opportunities.

Additional Information: Supplementing the summary of matter, FRT provides in-depth case information including allegations involved, defendant parties, and case status. In addition, this section provides a comprehensive FAQ of all relevant and known information for assessing eligibility, potential for recovery, potential recovery amount, and ways in which FRT can facilitate in the recovery process.