

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

In re: AMAZON WAGE CLAIM  
LITIGATION

CASE NO. C16-1554-JCC  
CASE NO. C19-1320-JCC  
CASE NO. C23-0161-JCC  
CASE NO. C23-0178-JCC

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on the parties’ responses to the Court’s order to show cause why these matters should not be consolidated for further proceedings. *See Rittmann, et al. v. Amazon.com Inc., et al.*, C16-1554-JCC, Dkt. No. 282 (W.D. Wash. 2016); *Waithaka v. Amazon.com Inc., et. al.*, C19-1320-JCC, Dkt. No. 155 (W.D. Wash. 2019); *Marcelo, et al. v. Amazon.com Inc., et. al.*, C23-0161-JCC, Dkt. No. 55 (W.D. Wash. 2023); *Sitaca, et al. v. Amazon.com Inc., et al.*, C23-0178-JCC, Dkt. No. 38 (W.D. Wash. 2023). Based on the reasoning provided in the *Rittman* Plaintiffs’ response (Dkt. No. 283), which the Court incorporates as its own, the Court **will not** further consolidate these matters.

Given the chronology of the *Marcelo* and *Sitaca* actions, and the similarity of their parties and issues with *Rittman*, the Court **STAYS *Marcelo*, C23-0161-JCC, and *Sitaca*, C23-0178-JCC, pending a final ruling on the merits in *Rittman*, C16-1554-JCC.** This is consistent with the first to file rule, as well as this Court’s inherent authority to control cases on its docket.

ORDER  
CASE NOS. C16-1554-JCC, C19-1320-JCC, C23-0161-JCC, C23-0178-JCC  
PAGE - 1

1 *See T-Mobile N.E., LLC v. Sel. Ins. Co. of Am.*, 2018 WL 3417110, slip op. at 2–4 (W.D. Wash.  
2 2018) (citing *Cedars-Sinai Med. Ctr. v. Shalala*, 125 F.3d 765, 769 (9th Cir. 1997)); *see also*  
3 *Kohn Law Grp., Inc. v. Auto Parts Mfg. Miss., Inc.*, 787 F.3d 1237, 1239 (9th Cir. 2015)  
4 (articulating factors in applying the first to file rule). Doing so will eliminate the risk of  
5 inconsistent rulings between each case and avoid duplicative putative class action litigation  
6 involving the same parties and claims. Moreover, the possibility of prejudice to the *Marcelo* and  
7 *Sitaca* plaintiffs is low. If *Rittman* is certified, they may elect to participate as members in  
8 *Rittman*. And if not, at a minimum, many of the legal determinations made in *Rittman* would  
9 apply with equal force to *Marcelo* and *Sitaca*.

10 In contrast, *Waithaka* is not appropriate for consolidation based on its case development  
11 and the dissimilar claims to that of *Rittman*. However, given the current pendency of rulings  
12 from the Ninth Circuit in *Carmona v. Domino’s Pizza LLC*, No. 21-55009 (9th Cir.), and *Miller*  
13 *v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, No. 21-36048 (9th Cir.), **the Court EXTENDS the stay in *Waithaka*,**  
14 **C19-1320-JCC, and again STAYS *Rittman*, C16-1554-JCC, pending the Ninth Circuit’s**  
15 **mandate in *Carmona* or *Miller*, whichever is issued later.** This stay applies to all putative  
16 plaintiffs in both *Rittman* and *Waithaka*, including non-arbitration opt-in plaintiffs. While the  
17 Court appreciates the impact of this ruling on those plaintiffs, it must balance this with  
18 considerations of judicial efficiency and the need for consistent rulings for all plaintiffs on shared  
19 issues. This would be difficult to accomplish were the Court to allow *Rittman* to proceed for the  
20 non-arbitration plaintiffs but not for the plaintiffs potentially impacted by potential Ninth Circuit  
21 rulings in *Carmona* and/or *Miller*. Moreover, the Court notes that *Rittman* was filed many years  
22 ago. At this point, a short delay would not materially prejudice any of its plaintiffs.

23 **The parties in *Waithaka*, C19-1320-JCC, and *Rittman*, C16-1554-JCC, are hereby**  
24 **ORDERED, within fourteen (14) days of the later-filed Ninth Circuit mandate in *Carmona***  
25 **or *Miller*, to provide the Court with a joint status report** containing proposed case  
26 management schedules for their respective cases through class certification, with due

1 consideration given to possible renewed motions from Defendants in each case to compel  
2 arbitration and/or to dismiss and Plaintiffs' motions in each case for class certification. If the  
3 parties are unable to agree on a schedule, they may provide the Court with individual proposals,  
4 but must do so within a single joint status report for each case.

5  
6 DATED this 9th day of June 2023.

7  
8   
9

10 John C. Coughenour  
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26