UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CLARENCE YOUNGER,

Plaintiff,

v.

EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-06354-TEH

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE

Before the Court is Experian Information Solutions, Inc. and Equifax, Inc.'s Joint Motion to Consolidate filed on December 22, 2016. The agencies seek to consolidate more than 170 suits filed by Plaintiff's counsel and assigned to different judges in this district.

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 to decide whether consolidation is appropriate. *Inv'rs Research Co. v. U.S. Dist. Court for Cent. Dist. of California*, 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir.1989).

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 01/31/17

THELTON E. HENDERSON
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California