Owens v. Conley et al Doc. 143

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

RAVON OWENS,

Plaintiff.

٧.

Case No. 07-C-441

AMERICAN CYANAMID CO., et al., Defendants.

DECISION AND ORDER

I previously denied plaintiff's motion to partially consolidate this case with other cases pending in this district, three of which are pending before me¹ and the fourth, <u>Gibson v. American Cyanamid</u>, case number 07C0864, which is pending before Judge Randa. Before me now, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a), is plaintiff's renewed motion to consolidate the cases or, alternatively, pursuant to Civil L.R. 3(b), to designate them as related and reassign <u>Gibson</u> to me. Plaintiff contends that consolidation will facilitate processing the cases and particularly the discovery phase. I doubt that this is so and thus will decline to revisit my previous decision denying consolidation. As for the issue of assigning related actions, which is the concern of L.R. 3(b), that matter is generally addressed when a case is filed. <u>Gibson</u> has been pending in this court for over two years, and Judge Randa has rendered at least one substantive decision in the case. Under these circumstances, I will also decline to reassign Gibson.

Therefore, for the reasons stated,

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to partially consolidate or alternatively reassign Gibson is **DENIED**.

¹Burton v. American Cyanamid, et al., case number 07C0303; <u>Stokes v. American Cyanamid, et al.</u>, case number 07C0865; and <u>Sifuentes v. American Cyanamid, et al.</u>, case number 10C0075.

/s
LYNN ADELMAN
District Judge

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 10 day of August, 2010.