

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

PACIFIC COAST BREAKER, INC. et al.,

Plaintiffs,

No. CIV S-10-3134 KJM EFB

vs.

CONNECTICUT ELECTRIC, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

CONNECTICUT ELECTRIC, INC.,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-12-1533 JAM CKD

vs.

PACIFIC COAST BREAKER, INC., 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.

