

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  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RED EYED JACKS SPORTS BAR INC. )  
dab CHEETAH'S NIGHTCLUB, )

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF SAN DIEGO AND SHELLEY )  
ZIMMERMAN, in her official capacity )  
as Chief of Police, )

Defendants.

Case No. 14cv0823 L (RBB)

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART  
AND DENYING IN PART JOINT  
MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE**

Judge: Hon. M. James Lorenz  
Court Room: 5B

JANE DOE,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF SAN DIEGO, SHELLY )  
ZIMMERMAN, and DOES 1-100, )  
inclusive, )

Defendants.

**RELATED CASE:**

Case No. 14cv1941 L (RBB)

[CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]

1 TANYA A., STEPHANIE B., ANGELA )  
2 C., MINDY C., DIANA D., KATELYNN )  
3 D., HEATHER D., VALERIA E., )  
4 TIANA E., BERENIZ F., SARA G., )  
5 MARITZA G., CRYSTAL H., )  
6 CLARRISE J., EMILIA J. ANDREA L., )  
7 RENEE L., CHLOE L., KRISTINIA M., )  
8 MALLORY M., BRITTANY M., )  
9 ZINNIA P., CHELSEA S., LINDSAY T., )  
10 MARIYA W., LINDA E., BRIANNA H., )  
11 ROWSANNA M., JENNIFER S. and )  
12 ANGELA T., )

13 Plaintiffs,

14 v.

15 CITY OF SAN DIEGO, SHELLY )  
16 ZIMMERMAN and DOES 1-100, )  
17 inclusive, )

18 Defendants.

19 SUZANNE COE

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 CITY OF SAN DIEGO; SHELLY )  
23 ZIMMERMAN, as an individual and in )  
24 her official capacity as Chief of Police; )  
25 KEVIN MOYNA; PERRY McCIVER; )  
26 DAN PLEIN; CHUCK KAYE; and )  
27 DOES 1 to 50 )

28 Defendants,

**RELATED CASE:**

Case No. 14cv1942 L (RBB)

**RELATED CASE:**

Case No. 16cv1447 L (RBB)

21 Pending before the Court are four cases arising from police raids in July 2013  
22 and March 2014 on two adult entertainment establishments in San Diego, Cheetah's  
23 and Expose, based on the authority conferred by San Diego Municipal Code  
24 §33.0103. The cases were related under Civil Local Rule 40.1. In each of them,  
25 the parties simultaneously filed a Joint Motion to Consolidate Related Matters  
26 and/or Coordinate Discovery; for an Order Vacating Schedule in the Red Eyed  
27 Jacks Case; and Related Orders ("Joint Motion"). They request to consolidate all  
28

1 four cases. The *Coe* Defendants oppose consolidation for all purposes, but agree to  
2 coordinate discovery and other pretrial proceedings. For the reasons which follow,  
3 the Joint Motion is granted in part and denied in part.

4         In *Red Eye Jacks Sports Bar, Inc. dba Cheetah's Nightclub v. City of San*  
5 *Diego, et al.*, case no. 14cv823 (*Cheetah's*"), Cheetah's alleges two causes of action,  
6 claiming that §33.0103 is unconstitutional under the First, Fourth and Fourteenth  
7 Amendments, and that the allegedly unconstitutional conduct during the two raids  
8 was ratified by the Chief of Police. Cheetah's seeks declaratory and injunctive  
9 relief against the City, Chief of Police and unidentified police officers responsible  
10 for the acts alleged in the complaint.

11         In *Doe v. City of San Diego, et al.*, case no. 14cv1941 ("*Doe*"), one of the  
12 entertainers at Cheetah's who was working at the time of the July 2013 raid claims  
13 §33.0103 is unconstitutional under the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments  
14 on its face and as applied, that she was subject to unlawful search and seizure, and  
15 that the constitutional violations she suffered during the raid were caused by the  
16 City's unlawful policy, practice, or custom and unlawful ratification; and by the  
17 City's and the Police Chief's failure to properly train police officers. She further  
18 alleges violation of California Civil Code §52.1 ("*Bane Act*") for intentional  
19 interference with enjoyment of federal and California constitutional rights; and  
20 false imprisonment under California law. Doe alleges eleven causes of action  
21 seeking damages, declaratory and injunctive relief against the City, Chief of Police,  
22 and unidentified police officers.

23         In *Tanya A., et al. v. City of San Diego, et al.*, case no. 14cv1942 ("*Tanya*  
24 *A.*"), approximately thirty Expose and Cheetah's entertainers claim §33.0103 is  
25 unconstitutional under the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments on its face  
26 and as applied, that they were subject to unlawful searches and seizures, and that  
27 the constitutional violations were caused by the City's unlawful policy, practice, or  
28 custom and unlawful ratification; as well as by the City's and the Police Chief's

1 failure to properly train police officers. Like Doe, they also allege a Bane Act  
2 violation and false imprisonment. They assert eight causes of action for damages,  
3 declaratory, and injunctive relief against the City, Chief of Police, and unidentified  
4 police officers. Although at first *Tanya A.* may seem indistinguishable from *Doe*,  
5 the factual allegations and legal arguments differ in subtle but significant respects.

6 In *Coe v. City of San Diego et al.*, case no. 16cv1447 ("*Coe*"), the owner of  
7 Cheetah's alleges the City and the Chief of Police retaliated against Coe by  
8 revoking Cheetah's adult entertainment permit because Cheetah's entertainers and  
9 management complained to the media about the police raids and filed lawsuits  
10 against the City and the Chief of Police. She asserts four causes of action for  
11 retaliation in violation of the First and Fourteenth Amendments, violation of the  
12 Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and for supervisor liability  
13 and unlawful ratification of the permit revocation. Coe seeks declaratory and  
14 injunctive relief against the City, Chief of Police, four named police officers  
15 involved in the decision to revoke the permit, and several unidentified officers  
16 involved in the alleged wrongdoing.

17 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a) provides in pertinent part:

18 **Consolidation.** If actions before the court involve a common  
19 question of law or fact, the court may:

- 20 (1) join for hearing or trial any or all matters at issue in the  
21 actions;  
22 (2) consolidate the actions; or  
23 (3) issue any other orders to avoid unnecessary cost or delay.

24 In considering whether to consolidate, the Court "weighs the saving of time and  
25 effort consolidation would produce against any inconvenience, delay, or expense  
26 that it would cause." *Huene v. United States*, 743 F.2d 703, 704 (9th Cir. 1984).

27 Although the Joint Motion overstates the similarity of the related cases, it is  
28 apparent on the face of the pleadings that there is significant overlap of factual and  
legal issues raised in *Cheetah's*, *Doe* and *Tanya A.* cases, and to a lesser extent with

1 respect to *Coe*. On the other hand, each case names multiple unidentified police  
2 officers as Defendants. It is unclear whether they would oppose consolidation if  
3 any when they are identified and served. It is also unknown to what extent the  
4 unidentified officers differ among the cases. The potential difference in the named  
5 party defendants and their respective positions, and the differences in some of the  
6 factual allegations and legal theories raised in each case counsel against  
7 consolidation for all purposes at this time. However, the overlap of some factual  
8 and legal issues, and the efficiencies that can be gained to the judicial process and  
9 the parties in discovery and motion briefing, warrant some level of coordination.

10 Based on the foregoing, the Joint Motion is granted in part and denied in part  
11 as follows:

12 1. The request for consolidation for all purposes is denied without  
13 prejudice.

14 2. The requests for this Court to vacate the scheduling order and  
15 settlement conference in *Cheetah's*, and the early neutral evaluation conference set  
16 in *Tanya A.*; schedule a joint early neutral evaluation and case management  
17 conference for all four cases; and issue specific discovery orders are denied without  
18 prejudice. If the parties wish to pursue these requests, they must file an appropriate  
19 motion with the assigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to Civil Local Rule 72.1.

20 3. The parties shall forthwith contact the assigned Magistrate Judge to  
21 schedule a joint case management conference with a view to arrive at a joint  
22 discovery plan and pre-trial case management schedule consistent with this Order.

23 4. Any motions filed in the future shall be filed and/or opposed jointly by  
24 all parties who are impacted by the issues raised in the motion. The motions shall  
25 be briefed by omnibus briefs filed by the moving and opposing sides.


26 /////  
27

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

5) If at the completion of discovery and motion practice, the parties wish to consolidate any or all the cases for trial, they may raise the issue in an appropriate motion.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: July 29, 2016

  
Hon. M. James Lorenz  
United States District Judge