

1
2
3
4
5 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
6 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
7

8 **JERROD FINDER on behalf of himself**
9 **and a class of others similarly situated,**

10 **Plaintiff**

11 **v.**

12 **LEPRINO FOODS COMPANY, a**
13 **Colorado Corporation; LEPRINO**
14 **FOODS DAIRY PRODUCTS**
15 **COMPANY, a Colorado Corporation;**
16 **and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,**

17 **Defendants**

CASE NO. 1:13-CV-2059 AWI BAM
1:15-CV-0105

ORDER RE: NOTICES OF RELATED
CASES

18 This case is a proposed class action brought by employee Jerrod Finder against employer
19 Leprino Foods alleging violations of California wage and hour laws. Two notices of related cases
20 have been filed. Docs. 16 and 18.

21 The first notice involves Talavera v. Leprino Foods, 15-cv-0105 (originally designated 15-
22 at-0055). Talavera is also an employee seeking to represent a proposed class action against
23 employer Leprino Foods alleging violations of California wage and hour laws. These actions are
24 related within the meaning of Local Rule 123(a). They involve the same parties, the same events,
25 similar questions of fact and law, and would therefore entail a substantial duplication of labor if
26 heard by different judges. Magistrate Judge Barbara McAuliffe has already been assigned to
27 Talavera v. Leprino Foods but no district court judge is yet attached to the case. Relation of these
28 two cases is granted. The parties should be aware that relating the cases under Local Rule 123
merely has the result that both actions are assigned to the same judge; no consolidation of the
action is effected.

1 The second notice involves Finder v. Leprino Foods, 15-cv-0307. This is another suit filed
2 by Jerrod Finder against Leprino Foods. This case is not a proposed class action and involves
3 claims of disability discrimination and retaliation for taking leave under the Family and Medical
4 Leave Act. Of note Jerrod Finder objects to relation of these two cases. Doc. 6. These actions are
5 not related within the meaning of Local Rule 123(a). They involve the same parties, but deal with
6 different events, different questions of fact and law, and provide no savings in labor if heard by the
7 same judge. Relation of these two cases is denied.

8 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Talavera v. Leprino Foods, 15-cv-0105, be assigned
9 to the undersigned.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: March 13, 2015

12 
13 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE