1	
1	
2 3	
4	
+ 5	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7	JOSEPH AMBROSE, D.C.,
, 8	Plaintiff,
0 9	v. CIV. NO. S-08-1664 LKK/GGH
10	GARY COFFEY, et al.,
11	Defendants.
12	/
13	WILMER D. ORIGEL,
14	Plaintiff,
15	v. CIV. NO. S-09-2640 GEB/GGH
16	TRAVELERS PROPERTY AND CASUALTY COMPANY OF
17	AMERICA, A Corporation; WILLIAM REYNOLDS; THE <u>RELATED CASE ORDER</u>
18	COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN; JAMES C. WEYDERT; GARY
19	COFFEY; and DOES 1 to 100,
20 21	/
22	By prior order, this court related and consolidated three
26	GGH. Plaintiff in a fourth case, Origel v. Travelers Property and
23 24 25 26	cases concerning various civil rights claims brought chiropractors. These consolidated cases are currently proceeds as <u>Ambrose, et al. v. Coffey, et al.</u> , Case No. S-08-cv-1664-LH GGH. Plaintiff in a fourth case, <u>Origel v. Travelers Property a</u>

1

1 <u>Casualty Co. of America, et. al.</u>, Case No. S-09-cv-2640-GEB-GGH, 2 has filed a notice of related cases.

3 Examination of the above-entitled actions reveals that the Origel action is related to the consolidated actions within the 4 meaning of Local Rule 83-123(a). The actions involve the same 5 defendants, and are based on the same or similar claims, similar 6 7 questions of fact and the same question of law. Accordingly, the 8 assignment of the matters to the same judge and magistrate judge is likely to effect a substantial savings of judicial effort and 9 10 is also likely to be convenient for the parties.

The parties should be aware that relating the cases under Local Rule 83-123 merely has the result that the actions are assigned to the same judge; the Origel action is not consolidated with the other actions by this order. Under the regular practice of this court, related cases are generally assigned to the judge and magistrate judge to whom the first filed action was assigned. The court hereby orders that:

18

1. The above-captioned cases are RELATED.

The action denominated CIV. NO. 2:09-cv-2640-GEB-GGH is
REASSIGNED to Judge Lawrence K. Karlton and Magistrate
Judge Gregory G. Hollows for all further proceedings.
Any dates currently set in the reassigned case are
hereby VACATED. Defendants in the reassigned case are
DIRECTED to renotice the motions pending in that case to

25 ////

26 ////

1	reflect a hearing date available before Judge Karlton. $^1$
2	3. Henceforth, the caption on documents filed in the cases
3	shall be shown as CIV. NO. 2:08-cv-1664-LKK-GGH and CIV.
4	NO. 2:08-cv-2640-LKK-GGH, respectively.
5	3. The Clerk of the Court make shall appropriate adjustment
6	in the assignment of civil cases to compensate for this
7	reassignment.
8	IT IS SO ORDERED.
9	DATED: October 30, 2009.
10	
11	
12	LAWRENCE K. KARLTON
13	SENIOR JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	<sup>1</sup> The court notes that a motion to dismiss in the <u>Ambrose</u>
23	cases has been noticed for hearing before this court for November 23, 2009, and that a similar motion to dismiss has been filed in Origol provide a provide a provide a for bearing before Tudge Purpell on
24	<u>Origel</u> , previously noticed for hearing before Judge Burrell on November 23 as well. Although the court VACATES the hearing date
25	for the second motion, the parties may file a motion to shorten time if they believe that judicial economy would be served by
26	hearing the motions together. However, the parties are reminded that the cases have not been consolidated, and that the two motions will at this point be decided separately.
	3