

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

CHADERICK A. INGRAM

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-12-864 KJM GGH PS

vs.

CITY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

CHADERICK A. INGRAM

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-12-927 MCE CKD PS

vs.

CITY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

CHADERICK A. INGRAM

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-12-1089 JAM CKD PS

vs.

CITY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

1 CHADERICK A. INGRAM

2 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-12-1233 JAM KJN PS

3 vs.

4 CITY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,

5 Defendants.

6 \_\_\_\_\_ /  
7 CHADERICK A. INGRAM

8 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-12-1284 JAM DAD PS

9 vs.

10 CITY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,

NON-RELATED CASE ORDER

11 Defendants.

12 \_\_\_\_\_ /  
13 The court has received the Notice of Related Cases concerning the above-  
14 captioned cases, filed June 6, 2012. See E.D. Local Rule 123. The court has, however,  
15 determined that it is inappropriate to relate and reassign Civil No. S-12-927 MCE CKD PS, 12-  
16 1089 JAM CKD, 12-1233 JAM KJN GGH PS, and 12-1284 JAM DAD GGH PS, to Civil No. S-  
17 12-864 KJM GGH PS. The cases involve numerous and different defendants, albeit some of the  
18 same defendants appear regularly. More importantly, most of the cases are in stages where  
19 dismissal has been recommended, and a final order of adoption is awaiting signature from the  
20 district judge. Therefore, the court declines to relate the cases.

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 DATED: June 13, 2012

23 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows  
24 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

25 GGH:076/Ingram864.rel.wpd