

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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| JAMES C. MAXEY, |) | Case No. 2:15-CV-00552 JAM-EFB |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | |
| |) | |
| THE OFFICE OF PRESIDENT BARACK |) | |
| OBAMA, et al., |) | <u>RELATED CASE ORDER</u> |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |
| ----- |) | |
| JAMES C. MAXEY, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | Case No. 2:15-CV-01349 MCE-AC |
| |) | |
| v. |) | |
| |) | |
| STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |
| ----- |) | |

Examination of the above-entitled actions reveals that these actions are related within the meaning of Local Rule 123 (E.D. Cal. 2005). Accordingly, the assignment of the matters to the same judge and magistrate judge is likely to affect a substantial savings of judicial effort and is also likely to be convenient for the parties.

The parties should be aware that relating the cases under

1 Local Rule 123 merely has the result that these actions are
2 assigned to the same judge and magistrate judge; no consolidation
3 of the actions is effected. Under the regular practice of this
4 court, related cases are generally assigned to the judge and
5 magistrate judge to whom the first filed action was assigned.

6 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the action denominated 2:15-CV-
7 01349 MCE-AC be reassigned to Judge John A. Mendez and Magistrate
8 Judge Edmund F. Brennan for all further proceedings. Henceforth,
9 the caption on documents filed in the reassigned case shall be
10 shown as 2:15-CV-01349 JAM-EFB.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: June 30, 2015

13 /s/ John A. Mendez _____
14 JOHN A. MENDEZ
15 United States District Court Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28