

**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

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

