



1 court involve a common question of law or fact, the court may: (1) join for hearing or trial any or  
2 all matters at issue in the actions; (2) consolidate the actions; or (3) issue any other orders to  
3 avoid unnecessary cost or delay.” In exercising its discretion, the Court “weighs the saving of  
4 time and effort consolidation would produce against any inconvenience, delay, or expense that it  
5 would cause.” *Huene v. United States*, 743 F.2d 703, 704 (9th Cir. 1984). Here, the Court finds  
6 that the above-captioned actions involve the same or similar parties, claims, and questions of fact  
7 or law, and that consolidation will avoid unnecessary costs and duplication of proceedings. Thus,  
8 good cause exists to grant the motion to consolidate these cases.<sup>2</sup>

9 Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

- 10 1. Defendants’ motion to consolidate (Doc. No. 63) is GRANTED;
- 11 2. The above-referenced cases shall be consolidated for all purposes, including trial,  
12 pursuant to Rule 42(a);
- 13 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to file this order in each of the above-referenced  
14 cases;
- 15 4. Going forward, the parties and the Clerk of the Court are directed to file  
16 documents under only the lead case number. Future captions should indicate the  
17 lead case number followed by the member case number as follows:

18 **Lead Case:** 1:21-cv-00423-NONE-EPG

19 **Member Case:** 1:21-cv-01611-HBK

20  
21 Dated: November 19, 2021

  
HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 <sup>2</sup> “Motions to consolidate are considered non-dispositive and are within the pre-trial authority of the  
28 magistrate judge.” *Jackson v. Berkeley*, No. 3:19-cv-06101-BHS-DWC, 2020 WL 1974247, at \*2 (W.D.  
Wash. Apr. 24, 2020).