

United States District Court
Northern District of California

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DANIEL CISNEROS,
Plaintiff,
v.
J. VANGILDER, et al.,
Defendants.

**AMENDED ORDER RELATING CASES;
ADDRESSING REQUESTS FOR
EXTENSIONS OF TIME**

Case No. 16-cv-0735-HSG (PR)
Re: Dkt. No. 21, 28

BENDY A. FALLA,
Plaintiff,
v.
C. DUCART, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-0869-HSG (PR)

DANIEL MANRIQUEZ,
Plaintiff,
v.
J. VANGIDLER, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-1320-HSG (PR)
Re: Dkt. No. 18

OSCAR CHAIDEZ,
Plaintiff,
v.
J. VANGILDER, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-1330-HSG (PR)
Re: Dkt. No. 27

1 The order entered on September 27, 2016 is vacated and replaced with the following order:
2 Good cause appearing, the above-referenced cases are related and the Clerk shall reassign
3 case numbers C 16-0869 JST (PR), C 16-1320 MEJ (PR); and C 16-1330 NJV (PR) to the
4 undersigned.

5 The parties are instructed that all future filings in any reassigned case are to bear the
6 initials of the newly assigned judge (“HSG”) after the case number.

7 The dispositive motion briefing schedules currently set in Cisneros v. Vangilder, et al., No.
8 C 16-0735 HSG (PR) and Chaidez v. Vangilder, et al., No. C 16-1330 NJV (PR) are VACATED.
9 The Court will set a new briefing schedule after the operative complaints in Falla v. Ducart, et al.,
10 No. C 16-0869 JST (PR) and Manriquez v. Vangilder, et al., No. C 16-1320 MEJ (PR) are
11 screened and served.

12 Defendants’ motion to consolidate the cases for all purposes is DENIED without prejudice.
13 Although the cases involve common questions of law and/or fact, they do not present identical
14 claims. Further, as noted above, two of the cases have not yet been screened and thus are at
15 different stages of litigation. Finally, given that the cases were separately brought by four
16 different inmates, all proceeding pro se, consolidation poses a risk of confusion to plaintiffs. The
17 relation of the cases avoids the possibility of conflicting decisions and serves the interest of
18 judicial economy, and the Court intends to set the same dispositive motion deadline for all four
19 cases. Any further benefit from consolidation would be minimal. Accordingly, there will be no
20 lead case, and the cases shall continue to proceed under their separate case numbers. Should the
21 circumstances of the cases materially change, defendants’ may re-file their motion to consolidate.

22 Plaintiff Manriquez’s application for an extension of time to oppose defendants’ motion to
23 consolidate is DENIED as moot.

24 Good cause appearing, plaintiff Chaidez’s application for a 30-day extension of time to
25 make corrections to his deposition transcript is GRANTED.

26 //

27 //


28 //

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

This order terminates Docket Nos. 21 and 28 in Case No. C 16-cv-0735, Docket No. 18 in Case No. C 16-cv-1320, and Docket No. 27 in Case No. C 16-cv-1330.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 19, 2016


HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
United States District Judge