

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**

A.J.C.,

 Plaintiff,

 v.
CITY OF BAKERSFIELD,

 Defendant,

JAMES RAYMOND,

 Plaintiff,

 v.
WARREN MARTIN,

 Defendant.

Case No.: 1:19-cv-01302 DAD JLT
ORDER CONSOLIDATING THE ACTIONS

Case No.: 1:18-cv-00307 JLT

The Court may consolidate actions involving a common question of law or fact, and consolidation is proper when it serves the purposes of judicial economy and convenience. Fed.R.Civ.P. 42(a). The Ninth Circuit explained that the Court “has broad discretion under this rule to consolidate cases pending in the same district.” *Investors Research Co. v. United States District Court for the Central District of California*, 877 F.2d 777 (9th Cir. 1989). In determining whether to consolidate actions, the Court weighs the interest of judicial convenience against the potential for delay, confusion, and prejudice caused by consolidation. *Southwest Marine, Inc., v. Triple A. Mach. Shop, Inc.*, 720 F.

1 Supp. 805, 807 (N.D. Cal. 1989).

2 In these actions, the plaintiffs bring similar claims and they present similar questions of fact and
3 law. In the *Raymond* matter, James Raymond, the father of the decedent Augustus Crawford, claims
4 Crawford was unlawfully killed by a Bakersfield Police Officer. (Case No. 1:18-cv-00307, Doc. 1)

5 Ingrid Crawford Smith, Crawford’s mother, and A.C., by and through guardian ad litem
6 Tyshika Williams, initiated another action by filing a complaint in November 2018. These plaintiffs
7 are represented by the same attorney, Mr. George Mgdesyan, as in instant matter. In that action, the
8 plaintiffs named the chief of police and the City of Bakersfield in addition to Warren Martin, who was
9 named in Raymond’s lawsuit. The Court consolidated *Raymond* and *Smith* on March 14, 2019.

10 In this latest action, the plaintiff names the City of Bakersfield and the Bakersfield Police
11 Department—an entity of the City— and raises the claims as in the other two cases. Consolidation
12 would serve the purposes of minimizing judicial resources, and the Court anticipates little risk of delay,
13 confusion, or prejudice if the matters are consolidated. Consequently, consolidation is appropriate. *See*
14 *Pierce v. County of Orange*, 526 F.3d 1190, 1203 (9th Cir. 2008). Based upon the foregoing, the Court

15 **ORDERS:**

- 16 1. These actions **SHALL** be consolidated for all purposes, including trial; and
17 2. The parties are instructed that all future filings **SHALL** use the caption set forth above in
18 the *Raymond* matter and **SHALL** use case number 1:18-cv-00307 JLT.

19
20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: January 21, 2020

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE