



1 defendants, Maxim Healthcare Services, Inc., opposes consolidation for trial because (a) there  
2 are no common issues of law between the two lawsuits and (b) presentation of evidence tending  
3 to show deliberate indifference will confuse the jury and prejudice the non-municipal  
4 defendants.

5 Having reviewed the memoranda of the parties and the remainder of the records, the  
6 Court finds that consolidation for all purposes is appropriate. Both cases involve identical claims  
7 against Snohomish County arising out of the same events. Although proof of the damages  
8 suffered by each plaintiff may vary, there are clearly common issues of law between the two  
9 lawsuits. Nor will consolidation put the Maxim defendants in a more precarious or vulnerable  
10 position than they currently hold: evidence of the County's deliberate indifference will be  
11 presented at their trial whether the cases are consolidated or not. The savings of time and effort  
12 produced by consolidation far outweigh any hypothetical prejudice that might befall the Maxim  
13 defendants.

14 Plaintiffs' motion to consolidate is GRANTED. It is hereby ORDERED that cause  
15 number C17-0045RSL be closed and all documents filed in the future regarding these matters  
16 shall be filed under cause number C16-1124RSL and bear the caption:

17  
18 JOHN T. GOHRANSON, *et al.*,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.


21 SNOHOMISH COUNTY, *et al.*,

22 Defendants.

No. C16-1124RSL

23 Plaintiffs shall, within fourteen days of the date of this Order, file a Consolidated Complaint  
24 setting forth all of their claims in a single operative pleading. No new claims or parties shall be  
25 added. The existing case management schedule remains in place.  
26

1 DATED this 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2017.

2  
3   
4 Robert S. Lasnik  
5 United States District Judge  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26