1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STA	TES DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DIST	TRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10		
11	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1406 AWI JLT
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER RELATING CASES
13	V.	
14	H&K PARTNERSHIP, a California partnership dba Best Economy Inn & Suites,	
15	Defendant.	
16	THERESA BROOKE	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1407 LJO JLT
17	THERESA BROOKE,	
18	Plaintiff,	
19	V.	
20	C & S CHONG INVESTMENT CORPORATION, a California corporation	
21	dba La Quinta Inn Bakersfield North,	
22	Defendant.	
23	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1408 DAD JLT
24	Plaintiff,	
25	v.	
26 27	JDS HOSPITALITY GROUP, LLC, a California limited liability company dba	
28	Days Inn Bakersfield,	
	Defendant.	

1	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1409 AWI JLT
2	Plaintiff,	
3	v.	
4	JHP HOSPITALITY GROUP, INC., a California corporation dba Ramada Limited	
5	Bakersfield North,	
6	Defendant.	
7		
8	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1410 LJO JLT
9	Plaintiff,	
10	v.	
11	D.P.R.L. INVESTMENTS, LLC, a California limited liability company dba	
12	Hotel Rosedale,	
13	Defendant.	
14	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1411 DAD JLT
15	Plaintiff,	04001101121200111121212021
16	v.	
17	KOO JIN HYUN & CHU MYUNG HEE,	
18	trustees of the KOO JIN HYUN & CHU MYUNG HEE TRUST dba Hampton Inn &	
19	Suites Bakersfield North-Airport,	
20	Defendant.	
21	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1414 LJO JLT
22	Plaintiff,	Case 100 1.10-cv-1414 L3O 3L1
23	V.	
24		
25	PRIME HOSPITALITY SERVICES, LLC, a California limited liability company dba Hampton Inn & Suites Bakersfield/Hwy 58,	
26	Defendant.	
27	Detellualit.	
28		
	1	

1	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1415 LJO JLT
2	Plaintiff,	
3	v.	
4 5	RP GOLDEN STATE MGT, LLC, a California limited liability company dba Garden Suites Inn,	
6	Defendant.	
7		
8	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1416 LJO JLT
9	Plaintiff,	
10	v.	
10	YEHS FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST dba Rodeway Inn & Suites Bakersfield,	
12	Defendant.	
13	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1449 LJO SKO
14	Plaintiff,	Cusc No.: 1.10 CV 1447 LSO SIXO
15	v.	
16	KPK, INC., a California corporation dba	
17	Travelodge Turlock,	
18	Defendant.	
19	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1451 AWI BAM
20	Plaintiff,	
21	v.	
22	S&B HOLDINGS TURLOCK, L.P., a	
23	California limited partnership dba Hampton Inn Turlock,	
24	Defendant.	
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1454 DAD SKO
2	Plaintiff,	
3	v.	
4	LILJENQUIST MODESTO COMPANY, LLC, a California limited liability company	
5	dba Modesto Hotel,	
6	Defendant.	
7	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1455 DAD EPG
8	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	
10	METRO HOSPITALITY SERVICES, INC.,	
11	a California corporation dba Hampton Inn Fresno NW,	
12	Defendant.	
13		
14	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1456 LJO EPG
15	Plaintiff,	
16	V.	
17 18	JAYESHKUMAR PATEL, an individual; PRAFULBHAI PATEL, an individual, both individuals dba Budget Inn Modesto,	
19	Defendant.	
20	THERESA PROOKE	C N 1-16 1465 AWI SWO
21	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1465 AWI SKO
22	Plaintiff,	
23	V.	
24	KHATRI BROTHERS, L.P., a California limited partnership dba Clarion Modesto,	
25	Defendant.	
26		
27		
28		

1	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1499 AWI MJS
2	Plaintiff,	
3	v.	
4	A&A TARZANA PLAZA, LP, a California limited partnership dba Hilton Garden Inn	
5	Clovis,	
6	Defendant.	
7	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1502 DAD SKO
8	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	
10	AKSHAR, INC., a California corporation	
11	dba Parkside Inn Fresno,	
12	Defendant.	
13	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1503 DAD SAB
14	Plaintiff,	
15	v.	
16 17	THANDI ENTERPRISES, LLC, a California limited liability company dba Holiday Inn Express Fresno,	
18	Defendant.	
19		
20	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1505 DAD BAM
21	Plaintiff,	
22	V.	
23	BHAGAT BHAVESH, an individual dba Rodeway Inn Fresno,	
24	Defendant.	
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1506 DAD SAB
2	Plaintiff,	
3	v.	
4	FRESNO AIRPORT HOTELS, LLC, a California limited liability company dba	
5	Ramada Fresno Airport,	
6	Defendant.	
7	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1508 LJO EPG
8	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	
10	KAINTH BROTHERS, INC., a California	
11	corporation dba Country Inn Suites Fresno North,	
12	Defendant.	
13		
14	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1509 LJO SKO
15	Plaintiff,	
16	V.	
17	SHIV HOTELS, LLC, a California limited liability company dba Hampton Inn Fresno,	
18	Defendant.	
19	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1510 LJO EPG
20	Plaintiff,	Case No.: 1.10-cv-1310 EJO EI G
21		
22	V. SHIV HOTELS LLC a Colifornia limited	
23	SHIV HOTELS, LLC, a California limited liability company dba Hampton Inn Fresno,	
24	Defendant.	
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1511 LJO EPG
2	Plaintiff,	
3	v.	
4	SHRIGI, INC., a California corporation dba Welcome Inn Fresno,	
5	Defendant.	
6		
7	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1520 LJO BAM
8	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	
10	THE DAE SUNG & HEE JAE CHA TRUST dba Quality Inn Tulare,	
11	Defendant.	
12		
13	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1521 AWI BAM
14	Plaintiff,	
15	V.	
16	HANFORD INVESTORS, INC., a California	
17	corporation dba Comfort Inn Hanford,	
18	Defendant.	
19	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1522 LJO SAB
20	Plaintiff,	Cusc 11.10 CV 1322 ESO SIND
21	V.	
22		
23	INTERLINK PROPERTIES L.P., a California limited partnership dba Hampton	
24	Inn Visalia,	
25	Defendant.	
26		
27		
28		

1	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1529 DAD SAB
2	Plaintiff,	
3	v.	
4	NMA HOSPITALITY LLC, a California limited liability company dba La Quinta	
5	Tulare,	
6	Defendant.	
7	THERESA BROOKE,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-1530 DAD MJS
8	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	
10	TERRA INVESTMENTS I, LLC, a	
11	California limited liability company dba Charter Inn Suites,	
12	Defendant.	
13		
14	In each of the cases listed in the caption, the plaintiff complains that each of the defendants	
15	acted/failed to act in nearly the identical, if not the identical, manner related to compliance with the	
16	Americans with Disabilities Act.	
17	The Court's review of the cases reveals that the actions are related, as that term is defined in	
18	Local Rule 123. The actions involve overlapping questions of law and fact and are based on the same	
19	or similar claim and assignment to the same Magistrate Judge is likely to effect a substantial savings	
20	of judicial effort. Thus, the Court ORDERS :	
21	1. Each of the cases noted above, SHALL be related;	
22	2. Each of the cases, not already assigned to the docket of Magistrate Judge Jennifer L.	
23	Thurston, SHALL be reassigne	ed with the assigned District Judge remaining the same.
24		
25	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
26	Dated: October 20, 2016	/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
27		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
28		