

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Garcia v. Hap Trucking Ltd.

Garcia · No. 2:24-cv-01948-TLN-CKD; related case No. 2:24-cv-01496-TLN-CKD · Decided March 31, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California granted Plaintiffs’ unopposed motions to consolidate two related actions arising from the same motor vehicle accident. The Court ordered the cases consolidated for all purposes, directed Plaintiffs to file a consolidated complaint on the docket for Case No. 2:24-cv-01496-TLN-CKD, and directed the Clerk to close Case No. 2:24-cv-01948-TLN-CKD. Defendants were given 45 days after service of the consolidated complaint to answer.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Troy L. Nunley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	March 31, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-01948-TLN-CKD; related case No. 2:24-cv-01496-TLN-CKD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs moved, without opposition, to consolidate two related civil actions arising from the same motor vehicle accident.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Abuse-of-discretion framework governing consolidation under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a), weighing the conservation of time and effort against inconvenience, delay, or expense.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- joinder
- pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- torts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- 1. Whether the two related actions arising from the same motor vehicle accident should be consolidated under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a).

HOLDINGS

- 1. Actions presenting common issues of law or fact may be consolidated when the efficiencies from consolidation outweigh any inconvenience, delay, or expense, and these related actions should be consolidated for all purposes, including trial and pretrial matters.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The district court, in exercising its broad discretion to order consolidation of actions presenting a common issue of law or fact under [Federal] Rule [of Civil Procedure] 42(a), weighs the saving of time and effort consolidation would produce against any inconvenience, delay, or expense that it would cause.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The two actions arose from a single motor vehicle accident involving a tractor-trailer operated by defendant Gurham Singh Gill and owned or operated by Hap Trucking Ltd. In both actions, plaintiffs alleged that defendants negligently operated the tractor-trailer and failed to train and supervise Gill.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Garcia and Manago actions were pending separately in the Eastern District of California and involved common defendants and a common motor vehicle accident. The court granted the unopposed motions to consolidate, designated No. 2:24-cv-01496-TLN-CKD as the operative docket, directed plaintiffs to file a consolidated complaint, ordered defendants to answer within 45 days after service, and directed the Clerk to close No. 2:24-cv-01948-TLN-CKD.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Huene v. United States, 743 F.2d 703, 704 (9th Cir. 1984)

OPINION

Garcia v. Hap Trucking Ltd.

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 QUENTIN PAUL GARCIA,

12 Plaintiff, No. 2:24-cv-01948-TLN-CKD 13 v.

14 HAP TRUCKING LTD; GURHAM ORDER

SINGH GILL and DOES 1-25, inclusive, 15 Defendants. 16 17 18 19 No. 2:24-cv-01496-TLN-CKD

MICHAELA MANAGO,

20 Plaintiff, 21 v. 22

HAP TRUCKING LTD; GURHAM

23 SINGH GILL and DOES 1-25, inclusive, 24 Defendants. 25 26 This matter is before the Court
on Plaintiffs Quentin Paul Garcia and Michaela Manago's 27 (collectively, "Plaintiffs") unopposed
Motions to Consolidate two related cases. (No. 2:24-cv- 28 1 01947-TLN-CKD, ECF No. 20; No.
2:24-cv-01496-TLN-CKD, ECF No. 16.)¹ The two actions 2 arise out of a single motor vehicle
accident. In both actions, Plaintiffs allege Defendants Hap 3 Trucking Ltd. ("Hap Trucking") and
Gurham Singh Gill ("Gill") (collectively, "Defendants") 4 were in some manner responsible for an
accident in which, among other things, they failed to 5 operate a tractor trailer in a reasonable
manner and failed to train and supervise Gill, which 6 caused him to operate the tractor trailer in a
negligent manner. 7 "The district court, in exercising its broad discretion to order consolidation of
actions 8 presenting a common issue of law or fact under [Federal] Rule [of Civil Procedure]
42(a), weighs 9 the saving of time and effort consolidation would produce against any
inconvenience, delay, or 10 expense that it would cause." *Huene v. United States*, 743 F.2d
703,704 (9th Cir. 1984). Having 11 carefully reviewed the parties' submissions, the Court
determines that consolidation is 12 appropriate. Accordingly, the Court hereby GRANTS the
motions to consolidate. (No. 2:24-cv- 13 01947-TLN-CKD, ECF No. 20; No. 2:24-cv-01496-
TLN-CKD, ECF No. 16.) 14 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 15 1. The following actions are
consolidated before this Court for all purposes, 16 including trial and all pretrial matters: 17 •
Garcia v. Hap Trucking Ltd. et al., No. 2:24-cv-01496-TLN-CKD 18 • Manago v. Hap Trucking
Ltd. et al., No. 2:24-cv-01948-TLN-CKD 19 2. Plaintiffs shall have seven (7) days from the
electronic filing date of this Order to 20 file a consolidated complaint. The consolidated complaint
and any future filings shall be 21 solely made on the docket for No. 2:24-cv-01496-TLN-CKD.
Going forward, no filings 22 should be made under No. 2:24-cv-01948-TLN-CKD. The Clerk of
Court is directed to 23 close Case No. 2:24-cv-01948-TLN-CKD. 24 /// 25 /// 26 /// 27 28 1 The
instant motion has been docketed in each of the related cases. 1 3. Defendants shall have forty-five
(45) days after service of the consolidated 2 complaint to file an answer. 3 IT IS SO ORDERED. 4
| DATED: March 28, 2025 5 Lol 7

g TROY L. NUNLEY

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

