

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES—GENERALCase No. **CV 12-05453 DMG (JEMx), 12-06012 DMG
(JEMx)** Date August 21, 2012Title **Ronald F. Vaughn v. Wells Fargo Bank N.A., et al. and
Ronald Vaughn v. World Savings Bank, et al.** Page 1 of 1Present: The Honorable DOLLY M. GEE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGEVALENCIA VALLERY

Deputy Clerk

NOT REPORTED

Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff(s)

None Present

Attorneys Present for Defendant(s)

None Present

**Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS—ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE ACTIONS
SHOULD NOT BE CONSOLIDATED**

On June 22, 2012, Plaintiff filed a complaint in this Court pertaining to property in Long Beach, California, which action is pending before this Court as case number CV 12-05453 DMG (JEMx). On June 28, 2012, Plaintiff filed what appears to be an identical complaint in the Los Angeles Superior Court, which Defendant Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. removed to this Court on July 12, 2012 on the basis of federal question jurisdiction. The second action is pending before this Court as case number CV 12-06012 DMG (JEMx).

A court may consolidate actions pending before it if they “involve a common question of law or fact.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a). District courts have broad discretion whether or not to consolidate actions. *Pierce v. County of Orange*, 526 F.3d 1190, 1203 (9th Cir. 2008) (citing *Investor’s Research Co. v. U.S. Dist. Court for the Cent. Dist. of Cal.*, 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir. 1989)). In determining whether consolidation is appropriate, courts weigh “the saving of time and effort consolidation would produce against any inconvenience, delay, or expense that it would cause.” *Huene v. United States*, 743 F.2d 703, 704 (9th Cir. 1984).

In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff is hereby **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** why case numbers CV 12-05453 DMG (JEMx) and CV 12-06012 should not be consolidated. Plaintiff shall file his response on or before August 31, 2012.

IT IS SO ORDERED.