

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
HAMMOND DIVISION**

KENNETH JOHNSON,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	CAUSE NO.: 2:15-CV-54-RL-JEM
	)	
BOILERMAKERS LOCAL #374,	)	
Defendant.	)	

**OPINION AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Defendant’s Motion for Consolidation of the Instant Case with Case No. 2:16-CV-00019-JTM-PRC [DE 17], filed by Defendant on February 26, 2016. Defendant requests that this matter be consolidated with another case filed against it by Plaintiff, cause number 2:16-CV-19-JTM-PRC. Plaintiff has not responded to the motion.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a) provides that “[i]f actions before the court involve a common question of law or fact, the court may . . . consolidate the actions.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a)(2). Consolidation is appropriate for “cases that share the same questions of law or fact and where consolidation would not result in prejudice to any party.” *Back v. Bayh*, 933 F. Supp. 738, 748 (N.D. Ind. 1996) (citing *Fleishman v. Prudential-Bache Sec.*, 103 F.R.D. 623, 624 (E.D. Wis. 1984)). Courts “consider such factors as judicial economy, avoiding delay, and avoiding inconsistent or conflicting results” as well as “as the possibility of juror confusion or administrative difficulties.” *Habitat Educ. Ctr., Inc. v. Kimbell*, 250 F.R.D. 390, 394 (E.D. Wis. 2008).

The Court finds that the cases, both brought pursuant to Title VII and the ADEA against Defendant for employment discrimination, involve common issues of law and fact. Discovery has not yet begun in either case. Trying the cases separately would require duplication of efforts, both on behalf of the parties and of the Court, and might result in inconsistent results.

Accordingly, in the interest of judicial economy, the Court hereby **GRANTS** Defendant's Motion for Consolidation of the Instant Case with Case No. 2:16-CV-00019-JTM-PRC [DE 17] and **ORDERS** consolidation of cause numbers 2:15-CV-54-RL-JEM and 2:16-CV-19-JTM-PRC.

All future filings shall be made in 2:15-CV-54-RL-JEM **only**.

SO ORDERED this 16th day of March, 2016.

s/ John E. Martin  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE JOHN E. MARTIN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

cc: All counsel of record  
Plaintiff, *pro se*