



Rule 42(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure authorizes this Court to consolidate actions that “involve a common question of law or fact.”<sup>1</sup> Consolidation of Plaintiff’s cases will conserve judicial resources and permit the efficient resolution of Plaintiff’s claims. It is therefore **ORDERED** that this case, no. 5:16-cv-0462-MTT-MSH, be **CONSOLIDATED** into *Outlaw v. Owens*, 5:16-cv-0456-MTT-CHW and that the present case, 5:16-cv-0462, be **ADMINISTRATIVELY CLOSED**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 30th day of January 2016.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell  
MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

---

<sup>1</sup> “[T]he lack of any Rule 42(a) motion from any party in either of the two cases is no impediment to consolidation if the relevant considerations warrant same.” *Chambers v Cooney*, No. 07-0373-WS-B, 2007 WL 3287364, at \*1 (S.D. Ala. Nov. 2, 2007) (citing *Dedin v. Transportation Comm. Int’l Union*, 175 F.3d 121, 130 (2nd Cir. 1999) (“A district court can consolidate related cases under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a) *sua sponte*.”)).