| 1 | | |
|----|---|----------------------------|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | UNITED STAT | ES DISTRICT COURT |
| 9 | EASTERN DIST | RICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | DEVRA KEOKONGCHACK, individually | No. 2:13-cv-01385-TLN-AC |
| 12 | and on behalf of all others similarly situated, | |
| 13 | Plaintiffs, | ORDER OF NON-RELATED CASES |
| 14 | V. | |
| 15 | ADVANCED CALL CENTER | |
| 16 | TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, and DOES 1-50, inclusive, | |
| 17 | Defendants. | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | QUIANNA RAY, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, and on behalf | No. 2:13-cv-01472-KJM-DAD |
| 20 | of the general public, | |
| 21 | Plaintiff, | |
| 22 | V. | |
| 23 | ADVANCED CALL CENTER TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, a Georgia limited | |
| 24 | liability company, and DOES 1-10, inclusive, | |
| 25 | Defendants. | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| 1 | The undersigned judge declines to relate the above-captioned cases pursuant to Local Rule | |
|----|---|--|
| 2 | 123. Assignment of the matters to the same judge is not likely to effect a substantial savings of | |
| 3 | judicial effort or other economies. These actions involve the same or similar defendants, but the | |
| 4 | actions involve different proposed classes, there are unique facts and claims to each case, it is not | |
| 5 | clear that the same result should follow in these actions, and assignment to different judges would | |
| 6 | not entail substantial duplication of labor. | |
| 7 | Therefore, 2:13-cv-01472-KJM-DAD shall not be reassigned to the undersigned judge. | |
| 8 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| 9 | DATED: July 31, 2013 | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | my Hunley | |
| 12 | Troy L. Nunley | |
| 13 | United States District Judge | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | 1 | |
| | 1 | |