

Forest, 921 F.2d 1394, 1402-03 (8th Cir. 1990). The court must weigh the savings of time and effort that would result from consolidation against any inconvenience, expense, or delay that it might cause. Wright & Miller, *supra*, § 2383. “[D]istrict courts generally take a favorable view of consolidation” *Id.* Furthermore, “[a]ctions involving the same parties are apt candidates for consolidation.” *Id.* § 2384. However, under Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(b), consolidation is considered inappropriate “if it leads to inefficiency, inconvenience, or unfair prejudice to a party.” **EEOC v. HBE Corp.**, 135 F.3d 543, 551 (8th Cir. 1998).

The court finds that Case Nos. 8:07CV341, 8:07CV343, and 8:07CV344 present common issues of law and fact. Furthermore, consolidation of these matters will promote judicial economy. The same parties and claims are involved in both actions. Thus, the court believes consolidation will not lead to inconvenience, inefficiency, or unfair prejudice. Therefore, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a), **United States of America v. Kenneth Kohmetscher As Member of Ken’s Construction LLC**, 8:07CV341, **United States of America v. Kenneth Kohmetscher As Member of Ken’s Construction LLC**, 8:07CV343, and **United States of America v. Kenneth Kohmetscher As Member of Ken’s Construction LLC**, 8:07CV344, will be consolidated for all purposes.

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The petitioner’s motions to consolidate (Filing No. 3 in Case No. 8:07CV341, Filing No. 3 in Case No. 8:07CV343, and Filing No. 3 in Case No. 8:07CV344) are granted.
2. Case Nos. 8:07CV341, 8:07CV343, and 8:07CV344 are hereby consolidated for all purposes.

DATED this 4th day of September, 2007.

BY THE COURT:

s/Thomas D. Thalken
United States Magistrate Judge