

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DELPHINE ALLEN, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,
Defendants.

NO. C00-4599 TEH
ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
RELATE CASES

TIMOTHY SCOTT CAMPBELL,
et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,
Respondents.

NO. C11-5498 RS

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

These matters come before this Court on the *Campbell* plaintiffs’ administrative motion to determine whether *Campbell v. City of Oakland*, Case No. C11-5498 RS, is related to *Allen v. City of Oakland*, Case No. 00-4599 TEH; *Coles v. City of Oakland*, Case No. 03-2961 TEH; *Local 10, International Longshore and Warehouse Union v. City of Oakland*, Case No. 03-2962 TEH; and *Spalding v. City of Oakland*, C11-2867 TEH. After carefully considering both the moving papers and the timely opposition filed by the City of Oakland, the Court concludes that these cases are not related.

Civil Local Rule 3-12(a) defines cases to be related if they “concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event,” and “[i]t appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges.” These cases do not satisfy either part of this definition.

1 First, while there is some overlap in defendants, none of the plaintiffs in *Campbell* are or
2 were plaintiffs in any of the other cases. Nor do any of the cases before this Court concern
3 the same events that form the basis of the complaint in *Campbell*. Second, the *Campbell*
4 plaintiffs have failed to persuade the Court that there is likely to be an unduly burdensome
5 duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if this Court does not preside over the
6 *Campbell* litigation. While there may well be some overlap in issues, that is not the test for
7 relating cases; indeed, implicit in Civil Local Rule 3-12(a) is the principle that single judges
8 of this Court do not become responsible for all cases arising in one area of law, even when
9 some of the same parties are involved. Thus, for example, although this Court oversees
10 reforms in the Oakland Police Department in *Allen*, and those reforms include issues related
11 to use of force and internal affairs investigations, it is not this Court's province to relate all
12 cases that allege excessive use of force by Oakland police officers or all cases involving
13 allegations on which the Department has conducted an internal affairs investigation.

14 In light of all of the above, the Court does not find *Campbell* to be related, as defined
15 by Civil Local Rule 3-12, to any of the four cases over which this Court has presided. The
16 *Campbell* plaintiffs' motion is therefore DENIED.

17
18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19
20 Dated: 11/23/11



21 _____
22 THELTON E. HENDERSON, JUDGE
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
24
25
26
27
28