Prime Healthcare Services - Shasta, LLC v. Burwell

I

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DIST	RICT OF CALIFORNIA
10		
11	PRIME HEALTHCARE SERVICES –	No. 2:14-cv-02791-TLN-KJN
12	SHASTA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company doing business as Shasta	NOTICE OF RELATED CASE ORDER
13	Regional Medical Center,	
14	Plaintiff,	
15	V.	
16	SYLVIA MATHEWS BURWELL, in her official capacity as Secretary of the	
17	Department of Health and Human Services,	
18	Defendant.	
19	PRIME HEALTHCARE SERVICES – SHASTA, LLC, a Delaware limited	No. 2:15-cv-00450 KJM-CKD
20	liability company doing business as Shasta Regional Medical Center,	
21	Plaintiff,	
22	V.	
23	SYLVIA MATHEWS BURWELL, in her	
24	official capacity as Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services,	
25	Defendant.	
26	PRIME HEALTHCARE SERVICES –	No. 2:15-cv-473 MCE-CMK
27	SHASTA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company doing business as Shasta Regional Medical Center,	
28		1

1	Plaintiff,	
2	V.	
3	v. SYLVIA MATHEWS BURWELL, in her	
4	official capacity as Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services,	
5	Defendant.	
6		
7	PRIME HEALTHCARE SERVICES – SHASTA, LLC, a Delaware limited	No. 2:15-cv-474 MCE-CMK
8	liability company doing business as Shasta Regional Medical Center,	
9	Plaintiff,	
10	V.	
11	SYLVIA MATHEWS BURWELL, in her	
12	official capacity as Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services,	
13	Defendant.	
14	PRIME HEALTHCARE SERVICES – SHASTA, LLC, a Delaware limited	No. 2:15-cv-709-TLN-KJN
15	liability company doing business as Shasta Regional Medical Center,	
16	Plaintiff,	
17	V.	
18	SYLVIA MATHEWS BURWELL, in her	
19 20	official capacity as Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services,	
20 21	Defendant.	
21		
22	Examination of the above-entitled actions reveals that they are related within the	
23 24	meaning of Local Rule 123(a) (E.D. Cal. 1997). The actions involve the same parties, are based	
24 25	on the same claims, the same event, the same questions of fact and the same questions of law, and	
23 26	would therefore entail a substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.	
20 27	Accordingly, the assignment of the matters to the same judge is likely to affect a substantial	
28	savings of judicial effort and is also likely to be convenient for the parties.	
20		2

1	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the actions denominated 2:15-cv-00450	
2	KJM-CKD, 2:15-cv-473 MCE-CMK, and 2:15-cv-474 MCE-CMK, are hereby reassigned to	
3	District Judge Troy L. Nunley and Magistrate Judge Kendall J. Newman for all further	
4	proceedings. Any dates currently set in the reassigned case are hereby VACATED. Henceforth,	
5	the caption on documents filed in the reassigned case shall be shown as: 2:15-cv-00450 TLN-	
6	KJN, 2:15-cv-473 TLN-KJN, 2:15-cv-474 TLN-KJN. Furthermore, it is noted that the case 2:15-	
7		
8	cv-709-TLN-KJN, which is already assigned to District Judge Troy L. Nunley and Magistrate	
9	Judge Kendall J. Newman is also related to the above cases.	
10	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court make appropriate adjustment	
11	in the assignment of civil cases to compensate	
12	for this reassignment and issue.	
13	my - thinking	
14	Dated: May 22, 2015 Troy L. Nunley	
15	United States District Judge	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25 26		
26 27		
27		
28	3	