

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

AUTOTEK, INC. and CHRISTOPHER LULL,

Plaintiffs,

v.

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:16-cv-01093-KJM-CKD

CHRISTOPHER LULL,

Plaintiff,

v.

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:20-cv-00165-JAM-EFB PS

RELATED CASE ORDER

Examination of the above-captioned actions reveals that they are related within the meaning of Local Rule 123(a). Here, “both actions involve similar questions of fact and the same question of law and their assignment to the same Judge or Magistrate Judge is likely to effect a substantial savings of judicial effort.” E.D. Cal. L.R. 123(a)(3). Accordingly, the assignment of

1 these matters to the same judge is likely to effect a substantial savings of judicial effort and is
2 likely to be convenient for the parties.

3 The parties should be aware that relating cases under Rule 123 causes the actions
4 to be assigned to the same judge – it does not consolidate the actions. Under Rule 123, related
5 cases are generally assigned to the judge and magistrate judge to whom the first filed action was
6 assigned.

7 As a result, it is hereby ORDERED that Case No. 2:20-cv-00165-JAM-EFB PS is
8 reassigned from Judge John A. Mendez to the undersigned and from Magistrate Judge Edmund F.
9 Brennan to Magistrate Judge Carolyn K. Delaney. Henceforth, the caption on documents filed in
10 the reassigned case shall be shown as: 2:20-cv-00165-KJM-CKD PS.

11 It is further ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court make appropriate adjustment in
12 the assignment of civil cases to compensate for this reassignment.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 DATED: February 24, 2020.

15
16 
17 _____
18 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28