

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA

**David M. Routt, Jr. v. Henrik Fisker**

Routt v. Fisker · No. 2:25-cv-00627-FLA (KSx) · Decided March 27, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered the parties to show cause why the action should not be consolidated with two related actions involving similar claims against similar defendants. The court cited Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a) and directed written responses within fourteen days, limited to five pages.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA 10 11 DAVID M. ROUTT, JR., Case No. 2:25-cv-00627-FLA (KSx) 12 Plaintiff,  
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY 13 v. ACTION SHOULD NOT BE CONSOLIDATED WITH  
GEORGE 14 JENETOPULOS, ET AL., V. HENRIK 15 HENRIK FISKEER, FISKEER, ET AL.,  
2:24-CV-09760-FLA (KSX) AND STUART EGGERTSEN V. 16 Defendant. HENRIK FISKEER,  
CASE NO. 2:25- 17 CV-00236-FLA (KSX) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 1 ORDER TO  
SHOW CAUSE 2 Pursuant to Fed.

R. Civ. P. 42(a), a court may consolidate actions involving “a 3 | common question of law or fact”  
and has “broad discretion under this rule to 4 | consolidate cases pending in the same district.”  
Jnvs. Rsch. Co. v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for 5 | Cent. Dist. of California, 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir. 1989);  
see also In re Adams 6 | Apple, Inc., 829 F.2d 1484, 1487 (9th Cir.

1987) (courts “may consolidate cases sua 7 | sponte”) (citation omitted). “To determine whether to  
consolidate, a court weighs the 8 | interest in judicial convenience against the potential for delay,  
confusion, and 9 | prejudice caused by consolidation.” Paxonet Commc’ns, Inc. v. TranSwitch  
Corp., 10 | 303 F. Supp. 2d 1027, 1028 (N.D. Cal. 2003) (citation omitted).

11 Here, it appears the benefits of judicial economy and convenience from 12 | consolidating this  
action with George Jenetopulos, et al., v. Henrik Fisker, et al., Case 13 | No. 2:24-cv-09760-FLA  
(KSx) (“Jenetopulos Action”) and Stuart Eggertsen v. Henrik 14 | Fisker, Case No. 2:25-cv-00236-  
FLA (KSx) (“Eggersten Action”) outweighs any 15 | potential for delay, confusion, and prejudice,  
as each action asserts the same claims 16 | against similar defendants.

17 Accordingly, the parties are ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE in writing only 18 | within  
fourteen (14) days of this Order why this action should not be consolidated 19 | with the

Jenetopulos Action and the Eggertsen Action. Responses shall be limited to 20 | five (5) pages in length. Failure to respond may result in consolidation of the actions 21 | without further notice.

22 23 IT IS SO ORDERED. 24 25 || Dated: March 27, 2025 %6 FERNANDO L. AENLLE-ROCHA United States District Judge 27 28