

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JOHN WESLEY WILLIAMS,)	Case No. 1:16-cv-01584-LJO-SAB (PC)
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	ORDER REGARDING NOTICE OF
v.)	RELATED CASES
)	
C. BELL, et al.,)	[ECF No. 68]
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff John Wesley Williams is appearing pro se in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

This action is proceeding against Defendants C. Bell, S. Harris, R. Fischer, and Douglas for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need in violation of the Eighth Amendment.

On December 13, 2018, a notice of related cases was filed. (ECF No. 68.) Defendants submits that Williams v. Riley, et al., Case No. 2:16-cv-03002-JAM-DMC, is related to the instant action because both actions involve Plaintiff's treatment plan provided by the Department of State Hospitals (DSH) in 2016. (Id.)

///
///
///
///

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

Local Rule 123, provides, in pertinent part:

An action is related to another ... when

- (1) both actions involve the same parties and are based on the same or a similar claim;
- (2) both actions involve the same property, transaction, or event;
- (3) both actions involve similar questions of fact and the same question of law and their assignment to the same Judge or Magistrate Judge is likely to effect a substantial savings of judicial effort, either because the same result should follow in both actions or otherwise;
- (4) for any other reasons, it would entail substantial duplication of labor if the actions were heard by different Judges or Magistrate Judges.

Local Rule 123(a).

Although both cases involve the mental health treatment plan provided to Plaintiff, the cases involve different defendants, different time frames, and different evidence relating to Plaintiff's mental health status and treatment, such that it cannot be said the same result should follow in both actions.

Accordingly, the Court finds that the instant case should not be related to Williams v. Riley, et al., No. 2:16-cv-03002-JAM-DMC.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 30, 2019

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE