o et al v.	nsphere Insurance Solutions, Inc. et al	Do	
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	UNITED STATE	S DISTRICT COURT	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
10	GREG UMAMOTO and SHIRLEY	) Case No.: 13-CV-0475-LHK	
11	UMAMOTO,	) ORDER DENYING MOTION TO	
12	Plaintiffs,	) RELATE CASES	
13	VS.		
14	INSPHERE INSURANCE SOLUTIONS, INC HEALTHMARKETS INC.; THE	.; )	
15	BLACKSTONE GROUP L.P.; GOLDMAN SACHS CAPITAL PARTNERS; DLJ	)	
16	MERCHANT BANKING PARTNERS; KATHERINE FEENY; KENNETH	)	
17	FASOLA;KENT SCHOOLER;and DOES 1-50 inclusive,	), )	
18	Defendants.	)	
19		_)	
20	Defendants have filed a motion requesting that the Court relate the instant case to <i>Borgman</i>		
21	v. Insphere Insurance Solutions, Inc., Case No.	5:11-CV-05638-CRB (" <i>Borgman I</i> "). See ECF No.	
22	13-475. <i>Borgman I</i> was filed earlier than the instant case. Moreover, there appears to be another earlier-filed, potentially related matter styled <i>Borgman v. Inspehere Insurance Solutions, Inc.</i> , Case No. 12-CV-06352-EJD (" <i>Borgman II</i> "). Local 3-12(b) states that a motion to relate must be filed "in the earliest-filed case." Thus, Defendants should have filed their motion to relate in <i>Borgman I</i> or <i>Borgman II</i> . Accordingly, Defendants' motion is DENIED.		
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28		1	
		1	

Umamoto

c. 29

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

Case No.: 13-CV-0475-LHK ORDER DENYING MOTION TO RELATE CASES

1	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
2	Dated: April 1, 2013	Jucy H. Koh
3		LUCY <b>C</b> . KOH United States District Judge
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		
	Case No.: 13-CV-0475-LHK ORDER DENYING MOTION TO RELATE CASES	2

United States District Court For the Northern District of California