

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HENRY OSEGUERA,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS,  
INC., et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [16-cv-05706-HSG](#)


**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
CONSOLIDATE**

Re: Dkt. No. 26

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42 permits a court to consolidate actions if they “involve a common question of law or fact.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 42. “The district court has broad discretion under this rule to consolidate cases pending in the same district.” *Inv’rs Research Co. v. U.S. Dist. Court for Cent. Dist. of Cal.*, 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir. 1989). In considering a motion to consolidate, a court “weighs the saving of time and effort consolidation would produce against any inconvenience, delay, or expense that it would cause.” *Huene v. United States*, 743 F.2d 703, 704 (9th Cir.), *on reh’g*, 753 F.2d 1081 (9th Cir. 1984). Here, Defendant Experian Information Solutions, Inc. has moved for the Court to consolidate more than 170 similar suits filed by Plaintiff’s counsel and alleging violations of state and federal credit reporting laws. Dkt. No. 26. On balance, the Court finds that any efficiency gained by having a single judge hear the suits would be outweighed by the delay that would result from burdening a single judge’s chambers with over 170 cases—on top of its existing caseload. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** the motion to consolidate.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: 1/4/2017

  
HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
United States District Judge