

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

JOSEPH HARDESTY, et al.,

Plaintiffs,
vs.

2:10-cv-2414-KJM-JFM

SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AIR
QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, et al.,

Defendants.

JAY L. SCHNEIDER, et al.,

Plaintiffs,
vs.

2:12-cv-2457-LKK-DAD

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,
Defendants.

RELATED CASE ORDER

Examination of the above-captioned actions reveals that they are related within the meaning of Local Rule 123(a). Here, “both actions involve similar questions of fact and the same question of law and their assignment to the same Judge or Magistrate Judge is likely to effect a substantial savings of judicial effort.” Local Rule 123(a)(3). Accordingly, the assignment of these matters to the same judge is likely to effect a substantial savings of judicial effort and is likely to be convenient for the parties.

1 The parties should be aware that relating cases under Rule 123 causes the actions
2 to be assigned to the same judge – it does not consolidate the actions. Under Rule 123, related
3 cases are generally assigned to the judge and magistrate judge to whom the first filed action was
4 assigned.

5 As a result, it is hereby ORDERED that 12-cv-2457, is reassigned from Judge
6 Lawrence K. Karlton to the undersigned and from Magistrate Judge Dale A. Drozd to Magistrate
7 Judge John F. Moulds. Henceforth, the caption on documents filed in the reassigned case shall
8 be shown as 12-cv-2457-KJM-JFM.

9 It is further ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court make appropriate adjustment
10 in the assignment of civil cases to compensate for this reassignment.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 DATED: May 9, 2013.

13
14 
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE