

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

JOSE MENDOZA, JR., et al.,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION
INTERNATIONAL, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:18-CV-959 JCM (NJK)

ORDER

Presently before the court is the matter of Mendoza et al v. Amalgamated Transit Union International et al, case no. 2:18-cv-00959-JCM-CWH (“Mendoza II”).

On Tuesday, March 26, 2019, the court held a hearing to give the parties an opportunity to show cause why the court should not consolidate this case with related case, no. 2:17-cv-02485-JCM-CWH (“Mendoza I”). (ECF No. 92). As the parties did not object, the court ordered that the related cases be consolidated. (ECF No. 93).

To avoid undue prejudice to the parties, the court will deny without prejudice the pending motions in Mendoza I. See (ECF Nos. 66–68, 80, 89). The parties shall be permitted to renew the motions once discovery in Mendoza II has concluded.

This course of proceedings will allow the court to resolve any motions for summary judgment as to the claims in both cases simultaneously, thereby preserving judicial resources and promoting the expeditious disposition of these related actions. See, e.g., Dietz v. Bouldin, 136 S. Ct. 1885, 1892 (2016) (“This Court has also held that district courts have the inherent authority to manage their dockets and courtrooms with a view toward the efficient and expedient resolution of cases.”).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT defendants Amalgamated Transit Union International, Antonette Bryant, Lawrence J. Hanley, Carolyn Higgins, Tyler Home, James Lindsay, III, Keira McNett, Terry Richards, Daniel Smith’s (collectively, “defendants”) motion for summary judgment in Mendoza I (ECF No. 66) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED without prejudice.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT plaintiff Jose Mendoza, Jr.’s (“plaintiff”) motion for partial summary judgment in Mendoza I (ECF No. 67) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED without prejudice.


IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT plaintiff’s second motion for partial summary judgment in Mendoza I (ECF No. 68) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED without prejudice.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT plaintiff’s “Motion Declaring 29 USC 185 Unconstitutional” in Mendoza I (ECF No. 80) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED without prejudice.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT defendants’ motion for leave to file supplement in Mendoza I (ECF No. 89) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED March 28, 2019.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE