

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**JOHN CROWE, individually and
on behalf of all others similarly-situated,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**HARTWICK & HAND, INC, STACY
HAND, and DOES 1 through 100,**

Defendants.

**CV F 06-1302 AWI LJO
NEW CASE NUMBER**

**CV F 06-1302 OWW DLB
PRIOR CASE NUMBER**

**ORDER RELATING CASES
AND REASSIGNING NEW
DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
AND NEW MAGISTRATE
JUDGE**

Examination of the papers filed in the above-entitled action reveals that it is related within the meaning of Local Rule 83-123 to certain earlier-filed cases that are pending before this court. This case and the earlier-filed cases are based on similar claims and involve similar questions of fact or law, and assignment of all such cases to the same judge will therefore be likely to effect a substantial savings of judicial effort. The earlier-filed cases to which the present case is related include: Willis, et al. v. Cal-Western Transport, CV F 00-5695 AWI LJO; Barron et al. v. Cal-Western Transport, CV F 01-5563 AWI LJO; Baganha et al. v. California Milk Transport, CV F 01-5729 AWI LJO; Vasquez et al. v. Jim Aartman, Inc., CV F 02-5624 AWI LJO; Morales v. Five J's Trucking, CV F 04-5429 AWI LJO; Aguayo v. Oldenkamp Trucking, CV F 04-6279 AWI LJO; Rees v. Souza Milk Transportation, Co., CV F 05-0297 AWI LJO; Fuson v. C.L. Bryant, CV F 06-0766 AWI LJO; and Fuson v. Conti Materials, CV F 06-0769 AWI LJO.

1 According, the court ORDERS that:

- 2 1. This action is therefore reassigned to District Court Judge Anthony W. Ishii and
3 Magistrate Judge Lawrence J. O'Neill;¹
- 4 2. Henceforth, all documents filed in this case shall be filed under case number CV F 06-
5 1302 AWI LJO.

6

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 **Dated:** September 27, 2006
9 Om8i78

/s/ Anthony W. Ishii
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 ¹ The parties should be aware that an order relating cases under Local Rule 83-123 merely
26 causes the cases to be assigned to the same district judge; no consolidation is effected. Cf. Fed.
27 R. Civ. P. 42(a). If the parties wish consolidation they should so agree by stipulation or request
28 consolidation by way of a noticed motion.