28

1		
2		
3		
4		
5	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7	TOR THE WORTHERW DISTRICT OF CHER OR WIT	
8		
9	CHRISTOPHER WAGNER,	
10	No. C 13-04952 WHA Plaintiff,	
11	No. C 13-00054 YGR v.	
12	SPIRE VISION LLC, et al.	
13	SUA SPONTE JUDICIAL Defendants.  REFERRAL FOR PURPOSE OF	
14	DETERMINING RELATIONSH	IP
15	Plaintiff recently identified <i>Wagner v. Spire Vision LLC</i> , 13-00054 YGR, in a recent	
16	filing. The Court was unaware of this earlier action as both parties stated in their respective ca	0.0
17	management statements that no related actions existed (Dkts. Nos. 34, 36).	SC
18	The complaint filed in the earlier action is identical to the complaint filed in this action.	
19	The same plaintiff is suing the same set of defendants for allegedly sending the same set of spa	
20	emails. As both actions "concern substantially concern the same parties" and events, this action	
21	is referred to Judge Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers to determine relation. CIVIL L.R. 3-12.	11
22	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
23	II IS SO ORDERED.	
24	Dated: May 9, 2014.	
25	WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
26	ONITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
27		