

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
HATTIESBURG DIVISION**

**C.R.S. , A Minor,** **PLAINTIFF**  
**by and Through his Mother and**  
**Natural Guardian, Norma Michelle Hopkins**

**v.** **No. 2:08cv205 KS-MTP**

**DEANNA SNYDER and**  
**INTERSTATE DISTRIBUTOR CORPORATION** **DEFENDANTS**

**consolidated with**

**GEORGE STRONG, JR. and**  
**JEAN HANCOCK** **PLAINTIFFS**

**v.** **No. 2:08cv145KS-MTP**

**DEANNA SNYDER and INTERSTATE**  
**DISTRIBUTOR COMPANY** **DEFENDANTS**

**consolidated with**

**LOU E. STRONG** **PLAINTIFF**

**v.** **No. 2:08cv228 KS-MTP**

**DEANNA SNYDER and**  
**INTERSTATE DISTRIBUTOR COMPANY** **DEFENDANTS**

**ORDER CONSOLIDATING CASES**

THESE MATTERS are before the court on the motions<sup>1</sup> of Deanna Snyder and Interstate Distributor Company, defendants in each of the above captioned matters. Plaintiffs have not responded to any of the motions and, therefore, they are granted as unopposed pursuant to Local

---

<sup>1</sup>Docket no. [10] in civil action no. 2:08cv205, Docket no. [4] in civil action no. 2:08cv228 and Docket no. [20] in civil action no. 2:08cv145.

Rule 7.2(C)(2).<sup>2</sup>

Additionally, consolidation is proper pursuant to Rule 42(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which permits the court to consolidate actions involving common questions of law or fact, especially when doing so will avoid unnecessary costs or delay or will eliminate unnecessary repetition or confusion. *Miller v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 729 F.2d 1033, 1036 (5th Cir. 1984); *Mills v. Beech Aircraft Corp.*, 886 F.2d 758, 761-62 (5th Cir. 1989). Each of these three cases involves claims of the occupants of a vehicle which was involved in an motor vehicle accident with the defendants. These cases will utilize many of the same witnesses and records. The plaintiffs are represented by the same attorneys in all three cases and defendants Synder and Interstate are represented by the same attorneys in all three cases. The cases involve the same subject matter and involve many common issues.

Consolidation of these cases will serve to reduce the costs and expenses of all parties. Likewise, by eliminating duplicate motions on the same issues and eliminating multiple hearings and trials, consolidation will conserve judicial time and resources.

Plaintiffs have not objected to the consolidation of these matters and have not demonstrated or established any prejudice which might result if the motions were granted. Accordingly, the motions are GRANTED.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that these matters are hereby consolidated for all purposes, including trial. All future pleadings and filings shall be filed only in cause no. 2:08cv145-KS-MTP.

---

<sup>2</sup>Plaintiffs are reminded of their obligation to respond to motions or to file a statement that they do not intend to respond. *See* Local Rule 7.2(C). Failure to comply with the Local Rules may subject a party to appropriate sanctions. *See* Local Rule 11.2.

SO ORDERED this 19<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2008.

s/ Michael T. Parker

---

United States Magistrate Judge