



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

FRANCISCO FLORES et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA, INC.,  
Defendants.

JOSEPH JOSHUA DAVIS et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA, INC.,  
Defendants.

JAMES K. GRIMES and CARLOS  
RAMOS,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA, INC.,  
Defendants.

STEPHEN MCBRIDE et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA, INC.,  
Defendants.

1 LAWRENCE ELKINS et al.,  
2 Plaintiffs,  
3 v.  
4 COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
5 COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA, INC.,  
6 Defendants.

7 HERNAN PAEZ et al.,  
8 Plaintiffs,  
9 v.  
10 COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
11 COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA, INC.,  
12 Defendants.

13 KRIS COOK et al.,  
14 Plaintiffs,  
15 v.  
16 COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
17 COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA, INC.,  
18 Defendants.

19 KEVIN HUFFMAN et al.,  
20 Plaintiffs,  
21 v.  
22 COMCAST CORPORATION, and  
23 COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA, INC.,  
24 Defendants.

25 On July 13, 2016, the parties to the above-captioned related cases filed a stipulation to  
26 transfer the same cases to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.  
27 The parties state that after meeting and conferring, they agreed to seek a voluntary transfer of the  
28 related cases for reasons of convenience of the parties and for judicial economy, as eight related

1 cases are currently pending before the Honorable Jeffrey White. The parties further state that  
2 judicial economy and the convenience of the parties will be served: (a) by allowing a single court  
3 to decide the various legal issues that are identical or substantially similar in all cases; (b) that  
4 court should be located in the Northern District because the cases presiding within the Northern  
5 District are further advanced through the judicial process than those currently pending in the  
6 Eastern District; (c) because the Northern District is equally convenient for all parties and  
7 witnesses from all cases, and (d) all parties consent to the transfer. Moreover, the parties  
8 represent that they intend to relate and seek further consolidation of the above-captioned cases  
9 before the Honorable Jeffrey White once transferred and that at the last case management  
10 conference before Judge White, they informed him of their intentions.<sup>1</sup>

11 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), “a district court may transfer any civil action to any other  
12 district or division where it might have been brought or to any district or division to which all  
13 parties have consented.” According to the stipulation, the parties consent to such a transfer.  
14 Finding good cause and in the interests of justice, the court grants the parties’ stipulation.

15 Accordingly,

- 16 1. The parties’ stipulation to transfer this action to the United States District Court for the  
17 Northern District of California is granted;
- 18 2. The Clerk of the Court is directed to transfer this action to the United States District  
19 Court for the Northern District of California as soon as reasonably possible; and
- 20 3. All previously scheduled dates before this court are hereby vacated.

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: July 20, 2016

23   
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

26  
27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>1</sup> The undersigned has confirmed with Judge White that he is willing to accept the transfer of these actions.