

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
SAN JOSE DIVISION

BRENT DENTON,
Plaintiff,

v.

EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS,
INC., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [5:16-cv-04664-EJD](#)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
CONSOLIDATE**

Re: Dkt. No. 33

Defendants and well-known credit reporting agencies Experian Information Solutions, Inc. and, where named, Equifax Inc. (collectively, the “CRAs”), move under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a) for an order consolidating the above-entitled action with over one hundred other cases pending in this district, all of which share a common plaintiff’s lawyer and arise from similar legal theories and factual allegations concerning inaccurate or misleading credit reporting. The court has received written opposition to the motion.

This matter is suitable for decision without oral argument, and the associated motion hearing is therefore VACATED. Civ. L.R. 7-1(b). As to the arguments raised in the CRAs’ motion, the court finds, concludes and orders as follows:

1. Rule 42(a) provides that “[w]hen actions involving a common question of law or fact are pending before the court,” those actions may be coordinated through “a joint hearing or trial of any or all the matters in issue in the actions,” through consolidation, or by any other

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

dates to increase efficiency and convenience, and to minimize costs and other burdens.

Thus, having considered the relevant factors, the court finds that consolidation of the cases identified by the CRAs would not satisfy the purpose of Rule 42(a), particularly when individual judicial efforts are already being made to avoid unnecessary cost and delay. Accordingly, the CRAs' motion is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 6, 2017


EDWARD J. DAVILA
United States District Judge