

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

SCOTT JOHNSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
STARBUCKS CORPORATION,
Defendant.

No. 2:16-cv-02820 MCE GGH

ORDER

By way of this action and a number of others, Plaintiff Scott Johnson pursues remedies for Defendant Starbucks Corporation's purported violations of state and federal disability protections. Defendant has since sought an order from the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation ("JPML") to have these cases consolidated and transferred either to one court within this district or to another suitable court. In the meantime, Defendant also sought to stay this action until the JPML issues its decision.

As another court in this district has already pointed out:

According to Rule 2.1(d) of the Rules of Procedure of the JPML, "[t]he pendency of a motion . . . before the Panel . . . does not affect or suspend orders and pretrial proceedings in any pending federal district court action and does not limit the pretrial jurisdiction of that court." In other words, a court should not automatically issue a stay merely because a party has filed a motion for transfer with the MDL Panel.

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

Scott Johnson has been filing ADA cases in this court since 2004. See, e.g., Scott Johnson v. California Welding Supply, Inc., Civ. No. 2:11-1669 WBS GGH, 2011 WL 5118599 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 27, 2011); Scott Johnson v. Leoncio Nateras Ruiz, Civ. No. 2:14-1663 WBS AC, 2015 WL 3993144 (E.D. Cal. June 29, 2015); Scott Johnson v. Brian Kenneth Gross, 2:14-2242 WBS KJN, 2016 WL 3448247 (E.D. Cal. June 23, 2016). Since that time, he has filed more than two thousand such cases in the federal courts throughout Northern California. They have never before gone to Multidistrict Litigation, and this court has no reason to believe they will now.

Johnson v. Starbucks Corp., Case No. 16-cv-02797-WBS-AC. This Court agrees, and finds no reason to stay this matter either. Accordingly, Defendant's Motion to Stay (ECF No. 18) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 5, 2018


MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE