

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

VONDA LOUISE LOTT,

Defendant.

No. 2:17-mc-00130-KJM-DB

TAYLOR FARMS,

(and its Successors and Assignees)
Garnishee.

No. 2:13-cr-00202-KJM

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 the same parties and are based on the same or a similar claim.” Local Rule 123(a)(1). Accordingly, the assignment of these matters to the same judge is likely to effect a substantial savings of judicial effort and is likely to be convenient for the parties.

The parties should be aware that relating cases under Rule 123 causes the actions to be assigned to the same judge; it does not consolidate the actions. Under Rule 123, related

1 cases are generally assigned to the judge and magistrate judge to whom the first filed action was
2 assigned. Here, both matters are assigned to the undersigned. Thus, Plaintiff's request to assign
3 the two cases to a single United States district judge is DENIED as MOOT.

4 As to Plaintiff's other request regarding assignment to a magistrate judge, it is
5 hereby ORDERED that assignment of any matters under these cases to a magistrate judge shall
6 comply with 28 U.S.C. §§ 3008 and 636, including the issuing of proposed findings and
7 recommendations under 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(B) and 636(b)(1)(C) where applicable.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 DATED: October 12, 2017.

10 
11 _____
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28