

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.

OPINION

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