

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

CENTRAL SIERRA ENVIRONMENTAL
RESOURCE CENTER, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

No. 10-cv-02172- KJM-GGH

vs.

UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

_____ /
FRIENDS OF TAHOE FOREST ACCESS, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

No. 12-cv-01876-JAM-CKD

vs.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

ORDER ON RELATED CASE
REQUEST

_____ /
Examination of the above-captioned actions reveals that they are not related
within the meaning of Local Rule 123(a). Under Local Rule 123(a), two actions are related
when:

(1) [B]oth actions involve the same parties and are based on the same
or a similar claim;

1 (2) both actions involve the same property, transaction, or event;

2 (3) both actions involve similar questions of fact and the same question
3 of law and their assignment to the same Judge or Magistrate Judge is likely to
4 effect a substantial savings of judicial effort, either because the same result should
5 follow in both actions or otherwise; or

(4) for any other reasons, it would entail substantial duplication of labor
if the actions were heard by different Judges or Magistrate Judges.

6 Local Rule 123(a)(3).

7 The plaintiffs in *Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center v. U.S. Forest*
8 *Service*, filed on August 12, 2010, contend that their case is related to *Friends of Tahoe Forest*
9 *Access v. United States Department of Agriculture*, filed on July 17, 2012. (Notice of Related
10 Cases, ECF 56.) Specifically, plaintiffs argue that the two cases share a common defendant,
11 similar claims, “parallel administrative proceedings” and similar scientific issues relating to the
12 forest environment, such that assigning both cases to the same judge would likely conserve
13 judicial resources. (*Id.* at 3.) The Forest Service argues that the two cases do not meet any of
14 the factors under Local Rule 123(a). (Fed. Defs.’ Resp. to Notice of Related Case, ECF 57.)
15 Although both cases concern challenges to the Forest Service’s management of off-road vehicles
16 and involve similar questions of law, the challenged actions affect different geographical areas
17 and involve review of entirely separate administrative records. Thus, assigning both cases to the
18 same judge would not result in a substantial savings of judicial effort. The court declines to
19 reassign *Friends of Tahoe Forest Access* under Local Rule 123(c).

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 DATED: November 1, 2012.

22 
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24
25
26