

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  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANSAR EL MUHAMMAD,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
F. ORR, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:19-cv-01289-KJM-CKD P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this federal civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Upon filing a notice of related cases, defendants also filed a motion to consolidate pleadings in this matter with Muhammad v. Amaral, Case No. 2:20-cv-00069-WBS-KJN.<sup>1</sup> ECF Nos. 23, 25. In support of this motion defendants filed a request that the court take judicial notice of the related civil action pursuant to Rule 201(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Evidence. ECF No. 26.

The court grants defendants’ request to take judicial notice of Muhammad v. Amaral, Case No. 2:20-cv-00069-WBS-KJN, which was filed after the instant case was initiated. On November 16, 2020, the magistrate judge issued Findings and Recommendations that the Amaral case be dismissed as duplicative of the present action. See ECF No. 34 in Muhammad v. Amaral,

---

<sup>1</sup> Hereinafter referred to as the “Amaral case.”

1 Case No. 2:20-cv-00069-WBS-KJN. In light of this finding, there is no reason to consolidate a  
2 duplicative civil action. Therefore, the court denies defendants' motion to consolidate. By  
3 separate order, the court will refer this matter to the Post-Screening ADR (Alternative Dispute  
4 Resolution) Project in light of defendants' waiver of service of process. ECF No. 24.

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendants' motion to consolidate and  
6 extend the time to file a responsive pleading (ECF No. 25) is denied.

7 Dated: November 18, 2020



8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  

---

CAROLYN K. DELANEY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

12/muha1289.noconsolidation.docx