

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3  
4 RUBIROSA VIZCAINO,

5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 EXPERIAN INFORMATION  
8 SOLUTIONS, INC.,

9 Defendant.

Case No. 16-cv-05703-TEH

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
CONSOLIDATE**

10 Before the Court is Experian Information Solutions, Inc.'s ("Experian") Motion to  
11 Consolidate filed on December 22, 2016. Experian seeks to consolidate more than 170  
12 suits filed by Plaintiff's counsel and assigned to different judges in this district.

13 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42 permits a court to consolidate actions if they  
14 "involve a common question of law or fact." Fed. R. Civ. P. 42. The district court has  
15 broad discretion to decide whether consolidation is appropriate. *Inv'rs Research Co. v.*  
16 *U.S. Dist. Court for Cent. Dist. of California*, 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir.1989).

17 This Court joins other judges in the Northern District of California in DENYING  
18 Experian's request for consolidation. *See e.g., Mamisay v. Experian Info. Sols., Inc.*,  
19 No. 4:16-cv-05684-YGR (N.D. Cal. Jan. 25, 2017); *Gonzalez v. Experian Info. Sols., Inc.*,  
20 *et al*, No. 3:16-cv-05678-HSG (N.D. Cal. Jan. 4, 2017). First, the Court does not have the  
21 authority to consolidate cases not before it. *See* General Order No. 44(B) (granting the  
22 Court's Executive Committee the power to review assignment orders). Second, any  
23 efficiency gained by consolidation would be outweighed by the delay and undue burden  
24 resulting from assignment of over a hundred cases to a single judge.

25  
26 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

27 Dated: 01/31/17

28  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
THELTON E. HENDERSON  
United States District Judge

United States District Court  
Northern District of California