

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Solid Income Limited v. EnergyInvest LLC

Solid Income · No. 24-cv-09422-HSG · Decided August 12, 2025

OPINION

SOLID INCOME LIMITED v. ENERGYINVEST LLC

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 7 SOLID INCOME LIMITED, et al., Case No. 24-cv-09424-HSG 8 Plaintiffs, Re: Dkt. No. 41

9 v. 10 AMERICAN HOMEENERGY LLC, et al., 11 Defendants.

ORDER DENYING ADMINISTRATIVE

12 MOTIONS TO RELATE CASES

13 SOLID INCOME LIMITED,

14 Plaintiff, Case No. 24-cv-09422-HSG 15 v. Re: Dkt. No. 41 16 ENERGYINVEST LLC, et al.,

17 Defendants. 18 19 Solid Income Limited et. al vs. American HomeEnergy LLC et. al, 24-cv-

09424-HSG, and 20 Solid Income Limited vs. EnergyInvest LLC, 24-cv-09422-HSG, are related

cases currently before 21 the Court. Both actions were filed on December 26, 2024. 22 Defendant

American Home Energy asks the Court to find AEC Yield Capital LLC et al v. 23 American Home

Energy, Inc., 24-mc-80225-PHK, which was filed before Magistrate Judge Peter 24 Kang on

September 6, 2024, to be related to Solid Income Limited et. al vs. American 25 HomeEnergy

LLC et. al, 24-cv-09424-HSG, and reassigned to Judge Gilliam. Similarly, 26 Defendant

EnergyInvest LLC asks the Court to find Solid Income Limited vs. EnergyInvest LLC, 27 24-mc-

80224-SK, which was filed before Magistrate Judge Sallie Kim on September 6, 2024, to 1 Judge

Gilliam. The cases before Judge Kim and Judge Kang seek enforcement of default 2 || judgments

entered in federal courts in New York. 3 “[D]istrict courts [have] broad discretion in interpreting,

applying, and determining the 4 || requirements of their own local rules and general orders.”

United States v. Gray, 876 F.2d 1411, 5 1414 (9th Cir. 1989). One intent of Civil Local Rule 3-

12(b) is to direct motions to relate to the 6 || judge with the earliest-filed case. Generally, the cases

at issue are both district court lawsuits, 7 such that the earliest-filed case and the lowest-numbered

case necessarily are the same. But here, g || the miscellaneous-numbered judgment enforcement

actions before Judge Kang and Judge Kim 9 were filed in September 2024, three months before

the cases presently before this Court—24-cv- 19 || 09424-HSG and 24-cv-09422-HSG. 11 The

Court finds that these motions are more appropriately directed to Judge Kang and 2 Judge Kim,

whose cases were already “pending in this district” when the cases before this Court E 13 were filed. Civ. L.R. 3-12(b). Accordingly, the motions to relate, Dkt. No. 41 in both 24-cv- 14 09424-HSG and 24-cv-09422-HSG, are DENIED without prejudice to the parties seeking a 5 15 finding of relatedness explaining the basis under the law and the local rules for reassigning earlier- 16 filed matters to the undersigned. IT IS SO ORDERED. 19 Dated: 8/12/2025 | |

*0 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.

71 United States District Judge 22 23 24 25 26 27 28