

Significant Antitrust Representations

Mr. Bolognese has served as counsel and co-counsel for the plaintiffs in many of the most substantial federal antitrust actions of the past decade which have resulted in substantial court approved recoveries. These actions are multi-plaintiff, multi-plaintiffs' counsel actions, where counsel work together to achieve the recovery, and are compensated by the Courts in proportion to their involvement in the cases.

Mr. Bolognese has served as Court-appointed Lead Counsel, or Co-Lead Counsel, in the following antitrust class actions:

In re Ethylene Propylene Diene Monomer (EPDM) Antitrust Litigation, MDL No. 1542 (D. Conn.), an antitrust action brought on behalf of purchasers of EPDM, the third largest synthetic rubber consumed worldwide, which resulted in total recoveries exceeding \$100 million.

In re Hydrogen Peroxide Antitrust Litigation, Civil Action No. 05-666 (E.D. Pa.), an antitrust action brought on behalf of purchasers of hydrogen peroxide and related products, which resulted in total recoveries exceeding \$97 million.

Alco Industries, Inc. v. DuPont Dow Elastomers, LLC, Case No. 1:04 CV 00588 (D.D.C.), an antitrust action brought on behalf of purchasers of Polychloroprene ("CR"), a synthetic rubber product, which resulted in total recoveries exceeding \$36 million.

In re Polychloroprene Rubber (CR) Antitrust Litigation, 3:05-MD-01642 (D. Conn.), a related antitrust action brought against additional defendants, resulting in additional recoveries exceeding \$15 million.

In re Methyl Methacrylate (MMA) Antitrust Litigation, 2:06-md-01768 (E.D. Pa.), an antitrust action brought on behalf of purchasers of methyl methacrylate (MMA) and polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA), which resulted in total recoveries exceeding \$15 million.

In re Mercedes-Benz Antitrust Litigation, Master File No. 99-431 (AMW) (D.N.J.), an antitrust action brought on behalf of persons who purchased and leased new Mercedes-Benz automobiles, which resulted in total recoveries exceeding \$17 million.

In re Cotton Yarn Antitrust Litigation, 1:04 MDL No. 1622 (M.D.N.C.), an antitrust action brought on behalf of purchasers of cotton yarns, which resulted in total recoveries exceeding \$7.8 million.

In re Flat Glass Antitrust Litigation, MDL No. 1200, Master File No. 97-550 (W.D. Pa.), an antitrust action brought on behalf of purchasers of flat glass products which settled for over \$120 million.

In re Residential Doors Antitrust Litigation, Master File No. 94-CV-3744, MDL No. 1039 (E.D. Pa.), an antitrust action brought on behalf of purchasers of residential doors which resulted in a settlement of over \$14 million.

In addition, Mr. Bolognese served as Co-Chair of Discovery, directing the pretrial discovery process (document review, depositions, etc.) on behalf of all plaintiffs' counsel, in:

In re Vitamins Antitrust Litigation, Master Docket No. 99-0197 (D.D.C.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.^[SEP] This action was brought on behalf of purchasers of vitamins and vitamin byproducts alleging that the world's principal manufacturers of such products

colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels which resulted in a recovery by settlement of over \$1 billion.

In re Carbon Black Antitrust Litigation, MDL No. 1543 (D. Mass.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts. This action was brought on behalf of purchasers of carbon black alleging that the principal manufacturers of this product conspired to fix, stabilize and maintain prices at artificially inflated levels which resulted in a recovery by settlements of over \$20 million.

In addition, Mr. Bolognese performed services as plaintiffs' co-counsel in the following cases:

In re Steel Antitrust Litigation, Civil Action No. 08-cv-5214 (N.D.Ill.), an antitrust class action in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois alleging that the world's principal manufacturers of steel colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels which resulted in a recovery by settlements exceeding \$150 million.

In re Cathode Ray Tube Antitrust Litigation, Master File No. 3:07-cv-05944 - JST-MDL No. 1917 (N.D.Cal.), an antitrust class action in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California alleging that the world's principal manufacturers of cathode ray tubes colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels which resulted in a recovery by settlements exceeding \$125 million.

In re Urethane Products Antitrust Litigation, Master File No. 04-1616 (D.Kan.), an antitrust class action in the United States District Court for the District of Kansas alleging that the world's principal manufacturers of ^{SEP}steel colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels which resulted in a recovery by settlements exceeding \$900 million.

In Air Cargo Antitrust Litigation, MDL No. 1775, 06-MD-1775 (E.D.N.Y.), an antitrust class action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York alleging that the world's principal suppliers of air cargo services colluded to fix their freight surcharges at artificially inflated levels which resulted in a recovery by settlements exceeding \$1 billion.

In re Rubber Chemicals Antitrust Litigation, Master Docket No. C-03-1496 (N.D. Cal.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California alleging that the world's principal manufacturers of rubber chemicals colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels which resulted in a recovery by settlements exceeding \$250 million.

Fears, et al. v. Wilhelmina Model Agency, Inc., et al., 02-CV-4911 (S.D.N.Y.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York alleging that the major New York modeling agencies conspired, among other things, to fix the commission rates charged to models for the procurement of work which resulted in a recovery by settlements exceeding \$23 million.

In re Organic Peroxide Antitrust Litigation, (D.D.C.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia alleging that the principal manufacturers of such products colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels which resulted in a recovery by settlements exceeding \$30 million.

In re First Data Bank Antitrust Litigation, (D.D.C.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia alleging that the principal manufacturer of such products monopolized the market, resulting in artificially inflated, supra-competitive prices for the product which resulted in a recovery by settlements of \$26 million.

Linens of Europe, Inc. v. Best Metropolitan Towel and Linen Supply, Inc., et al., 03 Civ. 9612 (S.D.N.Y.), in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York alleging that the main suppliers of linens and linen services to the New York restaurant industry colluded to fix prices of their products and services at artificially inflated levels which resulted in a recovery by settlements exceeding \$6 million in cash and \$3 million in vouchers.

Industrial Graphite Products, Inc. v. Carbone of America Industries Corp., et al., Civil Action No. 00-1857 (E.D. Pa.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania alleging that the world's principal manufacturers of such products colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels which resulted in a recovery by settlements exceeding \$11 million.

In re Monosodium Gluconate Antitrust Litigation, (D. Minn), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota alleging that the world's principal manufacturers of such products colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels which resulted in a recovery by settlements exceeding \$80 million.

In re Potassium Sorbate Antitrust Litigation, an antitrust action in the Northern District of California alleging that the world's principal manufacturers of such products colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels which resulted in settlements exceeding \$90 million.

In re Bromine Antitrust Litigation, (N.D. Ind.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana alleging that the world's principal manufacturers of such products colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels which resulted in settlements exceeding \$9 million.

In re Auction Houses Antitrust Litigation, Master File No. 00 Civ. 0648 (LAK) (S.D.N.Y.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York alleging that the auction houses colluded to fix the commissions they charge to purchasers and sellers at artificially inflated levels which resulted in settlements exceeding \$400 million.

In re Commercial Tissue Products Antitrust Litigation, MDL No. 1189 (N.D. Fla.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida alleging that the world's principal manufacturers of such products colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels which resulted in settlements exceeding \$50 million.

In re Nine West Shoes Antitrust Litigation, (S.D.N.Y.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York alleging that Nine West and other manufacturers of such products colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels which resulted in settlements exceeding \$20 million.

In re Magnetic Audio Tapes Antitrust Litigation, (S.D.N.Y.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York alleging that the world's principal manufacturers of magnetic audio tapes colluded to fix the prices of such products at artificially inflated levels resulted in settlements exceeding \$10 million.

In re Domestic Air Transportation Antitrust Litigation, Master File No. 1:90-CV-2485 (N.D. Ga.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia alleging that such airlines colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels resulted in settlements valued at several hundred million dollars.

In re Catfish Antitrust Litigation, Civil Action No. 2:92-CV-073-D-O (N.D. Miss.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi alleging that major catfish farmers colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels resulted in a recovery in settlements exceeding \$20 million.

In re Waste Haulers' Antitrust Litigation, Master File No 87-3717 (E.D. Pa.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania alleging that the two leading national waste disposal services providers colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels which resulted in settlements exceeding \$25 million.

In re Chlorine and Caustic Soda Antitrust Litigation, Master File No. 86-5428 (E.D. Pa.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania alleging that major chlorine and caustic soda producers colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels which resulted in settlements exceeding \$25 million.

In re Toys "R" Us, Inc. Antitrust Litigation, MDL No. 1211 (E.D.N.Y.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York alleging that major national retailers colluded with toy manufacturers to restrict competition in the sale of toys to consumers which resulted in settlements exceeding \$56 million in cash and products.

In re D.C. Soft Drinks Antitrust Litigation, Master File No. 86-2974 (D.D.C.), an antitrust action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, alleging that major soda bottlers in the Washington, D.C. area colluded to fix prices at artificially inflated levels which resulted in settlements exceeding \$8 million.