lesnick et a	v. Walmart.com USA LLC et al		Doc. 25
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DIS	STRICT COURT	
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	JONATHAN GROCE and SUSAN HOROWITZ, on		
11	behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,	Case No. 09-cv-0139 MEJ	
12	Plaintiffs,		
13	VS.	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO	
14		CONSIDER WHETHER CASES	
15	NETFLIX, INC., WAL-MART STORES, INC., and WALMART.COM USA LLC,	SHOULD BE RELATED	
16	Defendants.		
17	Borondanis.		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION T	O CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED	
	1		

1	On January 12, 2009, Plaintiffs in Groce, et al. v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. 09-cv-0139
2	MEJ, filed an Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related, pursuant to
3	Local Rule 3-12. The Court, having considered the papers and pleadings on file, and good cause
4	appearing, HEREBY GRANTS the motion.
5	IT IS ORDERED that Groce, et al. v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. 09-cv-0139 MEJ, is hereby
6	related to Resnick, et al. v. Walmart.com USA LLC, Case No. 09-cv-0096 PJH.
7	Groce, et al. v. Netflix, Inc., et al. shall be reassigned to the undersigned judge pursuant to
8	local Rule 3-12(f).
9	
10	Dated:
11	By:
12	The Honorable Phyllis J. Hamilton United States District Judge
13	Cinica States District range
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	