

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 JOSEPH CECCHINI,

12 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-08-0516 FCD DAD

13 v.

14 TIDA IENG, et. al.,

RELATED CASE ORDER

15 Defendants.
16 _____/

17 JOSEPH CECCHINI,

18 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-08-1385 FCD KJM

19 v.

20 RICHARD FINLEY, et. al.,

21 Defendants.
22 _____/

23 Examination of the above-entitled actions reveals that they are related within the meaning
24 of Local Rule 83-123(a) (E.D. Cal. 1997). The actions involve the same parties, are based on the
25 same or similar claims, the same property transaction or event, similar questions of fact and the
26 same questions of law, and would therefore entail a substantial duplication of labor if heard by
27 different judges. Accordingly, the assignment of the matters to the same judge is likely to effect
28 a substantial savings of judicial effort and is also likely to be convenient for the parties.

///


1 The parties should be aware that relating the cases under Local Rule 83-123 merely has
2 the result that these actions are assigned to the same judge; no consolidation of the actions is
3 effected. Under the regular practice of this court, related cases are generally assigned to the
4 judge and magistrate judge to whom the first filed action was assigned.

5 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the actions denominated, CIV S-08-1385 FCD
6 KJM, having already been randomly assigned to Judge Frank C. Damrell, Jr., does not require
7 reassignment. However, the matter shall be reassigned to Magistrate Judge Dale A. Drozd for
8 all further proceedings. Henceforth, the caption on documents filed in the reassigned case shall
9 be shown as: CIV S-08-1385 FCD DAD.

10 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court make appropriate adjustment in the
11 assignment of civil cases to compensate for this reassignment.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 DATED: January 12, 2009

14
15 
16 FRANK C. DAMRELL, JR.
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28