

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**

TIMOTHY DAUBERT,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF LINDSAY

Defendants

) **1:09cv1270 AWI GSA**
) **1:09cv1338 AWI GSA**
) **1:10cv0014 AWI GSA**
) **1:10cv0015 AWI GSA**
) **1:10cv0016 AWI GSA**

) **NEW CASE NUMBER**

) **1:09cv1270 AWI GSA**
) **1:09cv1338 LJO DLB**
) **1:10cv0014 AWI GSA**
) **1:10cv0015 OWW SMS**
) **1:10cv0016 OWW SMS**

) **OLD CASE NUMBER**

The court finds that the above-captioned actions are similar to *Daubert v. City of Lindsay*, 1:09cv1270 AWI GSA in that all cases appear to involve similar questions of fact and law and assignment to the same judge is likely to effect a substantial savings of judicial effort. See Local Rule 123. Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the above-captioned actions, being the higher numbered cases, are reassigned to the same judge and magistrate judge as the lower numbered case. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT any future pleadings should reference the

1 newly issued case number. The new case numbers are as follows:

2 **1:09cv1338 AWI GSA**
3 **1:10cv0015 AWI GSA**
4 **1:10cv0016 AWI GSA**

5 Failure to use the correct case number may result in delay in your documents being
6 received by the correct judicial officer.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 **Dated: February 23, 2010** /s/ Gary S. Austin
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28