IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI DELTA DIVISION

UNTARIOUS SIMMONS		PLAINTIFF
v.	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:11CV00245-WAP-JMV	
NORTH PANOLA SCHOOI	L DISTRICT, ET AL.	DEFENDANTS
	Consolidated With	
CATINA HINES on behalf o a minor	f GREGARIOUS HINES,	PLAINTIFF
v.	CIVIL ACTI	ON NO. 2:11CV00246-WAP-JMV
NORTH PANOLA SCHOOI	L DISTRICT, ET AL.	DEFENDANTS
	Consolidated With	
DYLAN HALL a minor, by a Mother and Next Friend, Lir	8	PLAINTIFF
v.	CIVIL ACTI	ON NO. 2:11CV00247-WAP-JMV
NORTH PANOLA SCHOOL	L DISTRICT, ET AL.	DEFENDANTS
	Consolidated With	
AKINDRE BROOKS a minor, by and through his Mother and Next Friend, Brenda Brooks		PLAINTIFF
v.	CIVIL ACTI	ON NO. 2:11CV00248-WAP-JMV
NORTH PANOLA SCHOOI	L DISTRICT, ET AL.	DEFENDANTS
	Consolidated With	
KIZZY MILAM on behalf of a minor	f CORDARIUS MILAM,	PLAINTIFF
v.	CIVIL ACTI	ON NO. 2:11CV00249-WAP-JMV
NORTH PANOLA SCHOOI	L DISTRICT, ET AL.	DEFENDANTS

Consolidated With

Mother and Next Friend, JoANN COLEY		PLAINTIFF
v.	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:11CV00250-WAP-JMV	
NORTH PANOLA SCHOOL DISTRICT, ET AL.		DEFENDANTS
Со	nsolidated With	
BRANDON BROWN a minor, by and th Mother and Next Friend, GLORIA HEN	8	PLAINTIFF
v.	CIVIL ACTION	NO. 2:11CV00251-WAP-JMV

GREGORY COLEY a minor, by and through his

NORTH PANOLA SCHOOL DISTRICT, ET AL.

ORDER CONSOLIDATING CASES

DEFENDANTS

Before the court are motions filed by the defendants in the above styled cases for consolidation of these cases under FED. R. CIV. P. 42(a). Specifically, the defendants seek an order consolidating these cases on the grounds that the individual actions arise out of the same incident, seek the same relief, and involve the same attorneys. The individual plaintiffs do not dispute this, and all respond that they agree to consolidation to the extent that the cases are consolidated for discovery purposes. The plaintiffs object to consolidation for trial purposes, however, claiming that such consolidation will strip them of their individual rights to prove damages, recover for individual harm, and present their own case to a jury.

The plaintiffs' perception of the matter is flawed. While consolidation works to join separate actions into one case for administrative purposes, each individual action retains its separate character, and no plaintiff is deprived of his right to a jury trial or the right to prove his own case. *See Miller v. U.S. Postal Service*, 729 F.2d 1033, 1036 (5th Cir. 2004). Ultimately, no plaintiff has presented the court with any ground beyond conclusory statements why these cases should not be consolidated for all purposes. Nevertheless, this order is without prejudice to any

plaintiff's right to seek a separate trial **within seven (7) days of the close of the discovery period**, **should adequate grounds arise.** Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the defendants' motion to consolidate is hereby GRANTED;

2. That the above styled cases are consolidated for all purposes;

3. That Untarius Simmons v. North Panola School District, Cause No. 2:11cv245-WAP-

JMV, is hereby designated as the lead case;

4. That counsel are directed to indicate in the caption of all documents filed with the court the lead case heading followed by all consolidated case headings and the words "consolidated with" directly under the lead case heading and between all consolidated case headings;

5. That all filings shall be made in the lead case;¹ and

6. That any motion under FED. R. CIV. P. 42(b) is due within 7 days of the close of discovery.

This 9th day of January, 2012.

/s/ Jane M. Virden UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹However, counsel are advised to select the option to "spread" filings to all other cases when prompted to do so in the ECF system.