

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-09-2445 KJM-EFB

vs.

SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES; et al.,

Defendants.

SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-11-0346 MCE-JFM

vs.

AMERICAN STATES INSURANCE CO.,

Defendant.

AMERICAN STATES INSURANCE CO.,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-12-1489 JAM-DAD

vs.

INSURANCE COMPANY OF THE STATE OF
PENNSYLVANIA,

Defendant.

RELATED CASE ORDER

1 Examination of the above-captioned actions reveals that they are not related
2 within the meaning of Local Rule 123(a). Here, although the actions numbered 11-0346 and 12-
3 1489 stem from the same event as the action numbered 09-2445, the three actions are not based
4 on a similar claim, nor do they involve similar questions of fact or law such that “their
5 assignment to the same Judge or Magistrate Judge is likely to effect a substantial savings of
6 judicial effort.” Local Rule 123(a)(1)-(3). Moreover, 11-0346 and 12-1489 would not “entail
7 substantial duplication of labor” if these actions are heard by different judges from 09-2445.
8 Accordingly, the assignment of these matters to the same judge will not effect a substantial
9 savings of judicial effort or be convenient for the parties.

10 As a result, these three cases shall not be related. The undersigned expresses no
11 opinion regarding the relation of 11-0346 and 12-1489 to each other.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 DATED: July 6, 2012.

14 
15 _____
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26