

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

DAVID HASSEL, et al,  
Plaintiffs,

No. CIV S-10-191 KJM P

vs.

D.K. SISTO, et al.,  
Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

J. OGO, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,

No. CIV S-10-513 GGH P

vs.

D.K. SISTO, et al.,  
Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

RALPH BLASINGAME, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,

No. CIV S-10-514 KJM P

vs.

D.K. SISTO, et al.,  
Defendants.

RELATED CASE ORDER AND  
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

\_\_\_\_\_ /

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

7 The parties should be aware that relating the cases under Local Rule 123 merely  
8 has the result that the actions are assigned to the same magistrate judge; no consolidation of the  
9 actions is effected. Under the regular practice of this court, related cases are generally assigned  
10 to the magistrate judge to whom the first filed action was assigned.

11 Although relation does not equal consolidation, the identical nature of these  
12 complaints suggests that consolidation would be appropriate.

13 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

14 1. All further documents filed in CIV NO. S-10-513 GGH shall reference the  
15 following case number: CIV S-10-513 KJM.

16 2. For all further proceedings, and any dates currently set in this reassigned case  
17 only are hereby VACATED.

18 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed make appropriate adjustment in the  
19 assignment of civil cases to compensate for this reassignment.

20 4. Counsel for plaintiffs in CIV. NO. S-10-153 and CIV NO. S-10-154 show  
21 cause within twenty-one days of the date of this order why these three actions should not be  
22 consolidated.

23 DATED: June 24, 2010.

24   
25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE