

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Scott v. County of Kern

Scott v. County of Kern · No. 1:24-cv-00423-CDB · Decided June 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants the parties’ stipulated request to consolidate three related actions under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a). The court designates Scott v. County of Kern, Case No. 1:24-cv-00423-CDB, as the lead case and orders that future filings be made in that action. The order also notes the parties’ consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction and states that a separate order will address case-management dates.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	June 4, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-00423-CDB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties in three related civil actions filed a stipulated request to consolidate the actions under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a) and consented to magistrate judge jurisdiction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court exercises broad discretion in determining whether and to what extent consolidation is appropriate under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure federal civil litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the three related actions should be consolidated for all purposes under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a).
2. Whether the parties' consent permitted a United States Magistrate Judge to conduct all further proceedings, including trial and entry of final judgment, under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1).

HOLDINGS

1. The actions should be consolidated for all purposes because they involve significant and substantial common questions of fact and law, and consolidation will reduce burdens, avoid inconsistent adjudications, and eliminate duplicative evidence and procedures.
2. The parties' consent under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1) permitted reassignment of the related actions to the undersigned magistrate judge for further proceedings, including trial and entry of final judgment.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“When multiple actions pending before a court involve common questions of law or fact, the court may order a joint hearing or trial of any or all matters at issue in the actions; consolidate the actions; and/or issue any other orders to avoid unnecessary cost or delay.” (at 1)

“The court has “broad discretion” to determine whether and to what extent consolidation is appropriate.” (at 1)

“In deciding whether to consolidate actions, the court “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 three actions arose from events involving the death of Stephen Ingle while in the custody of Kern County. The parties represented that the actions shared substantial common questions of fact and law and that consolidation would reduce burdens on the court and parties, avoid inconsistent adjudications, and eliminate duplicative evidence and procedures.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The three actions arose from the same incident involving the death of Stephen Ingle while in Kern County custody. The parties stipulated that the actions presented common questions of fact and law and requested consolidation. The court granted the request, consolidated the cases for all purposes, designated Scott v. County of Kern as the lead case, and ordered that future filings be made in the lead case.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Garity v. APWU Nat'l Labor Org., 828 F.3d 848, 855-56 (9th Cir. 2016)

- Inv’rs Research Co. v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for the Cent. Dist. of Cal., 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Blount v. Boston Scientific Corp., No. 1:19-cv-00578-AWI-SAB, 2019 WL 3943872, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2019)
- In re Oreck Corp. Halo Vacuum & Air Purifiers Mktg. & Sales Practices Litig., 282 F.R.D. 486, 491 (C.D. Cal. 2012)
- Huene v. United States, 743 F.2d 703, 704 (9th Cir. 1984)
- Single Chip Sys. Corp. v. Intermec IP Corp., 495 F. Supp. 2d 1052, 1057 (S.D. Cal. 2007)

OPINION

Scott v. County of Kern

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 DIANNA SCOTT, et al., Case No. 1:24-cv-00423-CDB 12 Plaintiffs,

ORDER ON STIPULATION

13 v. CONSOLIDATING CASES PURSUANT TO

RULE 42(a) 14 COUNTY OF KERN, et al., (Doc. 45) 15 Defendants. 16 Case No. 1:25-cv-00378-CDB 17 DIANNA SCOTT, et al., 18 Plaintiffs, ORDER ON STIPULATION

CONSOLIDATING CASES PURSUANT TO

19 v. RULE 42(a)

20 KERN COUNTY HOSPITAL AUTHORITY,

21 Defendant. 22 Case No. 1:25-cv-00377-CDB

23 ESTATE OF STEPHEN INGLE, et al., 24 Plaintiffs, O CO RD NS E O R L O ID N A S T T I I
N PU G L C A A T S I E O S N P URSUANT TO 25 v. RULE 42(a)

26 KERN COUNTY HOSPITAL AUTHORITY,

27 Defendant. 28

1 On May 12, 2025, the parties in Scott, et al. v. County of Kern, et al., Case No. 1:24-cv-00423- 2
CDB, Scott, et al. v. Kern County Hospital Authority, Case No. 1:25-cv-00378-CDB (“Action
378”), 3 and Estate of Stephen Ingle, et al. v. Kern County Hospital Authority, Case No. 1:25-cv-
00377-CDB 4 (“Action 377”), filed a stipulated request to consolidate the cases and consent to
magistrate judge 5 jurisdiction. (Doc. 45). 6 The parties represent that the cases arise out of the
same incident, namely events involving 7 decedent Stephen Ingle’s death while in the custody of
Kern County. Further, the parties stipulate 8 these cases present common questions of fact and law,
and consolidation is appropriate pursuant to 9 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a). Id. at 3-4. 10
When multiple actions pending before a court involve common questions of law or fact, the 11
court may order a joint hearing or trial of any or all matters at issue in the actions; consolidate the

12 actions; and/or issue any other orders to avoid unnecessary cost or delay. Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a). The 13 court has “broad discretion” to determine whether and to what extent consolidation is appropriate. See 14 *Garity v. APWU Nat'l Labor Org.*, 828 F.3d 848, 855-56 (9th Cir. 2016) (citing *Inv'rs Research Co. v. 15 U.S. Dist. Ct. for the Cent. Dist. of Cal.*, 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir. 1989)). “Typically, consolidation 16 is a favored procedure.” *Blount v. Boston Scientific Corp.*, No. 1:19-cv-00578-AWI-SAB, 2019 WL 17 3943872, *2 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2019) (citing *In re Oreck Corp. Halo Vacuum & Air Purifiers Mktg. 18 & Sales Practices Litig.*, 282 F.R.D. 486, 491 (C.D. Cal. 2012)). In deciding whether to consolidate 19 actions, the court “weighs the saving of time and effort consolidation would produce against any 20 inconvenience, delay, or expense that it would cause.” *Huene v. United States*, 743 F.2d 703, 704 (9th 21 Cir. 1984); *Single Chip Sys. Corp. v. Intermec IP Corp.*, 495 F.Supp.2d 1052, 1057 (S.D. Cal. 2007).

22 Here, having considered the stipulation, the Court finds there are significant and substantial 23 common issues of fact and law that warrant consolidation under Rule 42(a). Moreover, the Court 24 agrees with the parties that the benefits of consolidation would reduce the burden on judicial resources 25 and on all involved parties, eliminate the risk of inconsistent adjudications, avoid duplicative evidence 26 and procedures, and allow for the final determination of the survival action. 27 Additionally, the parties stipulated their consent under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1) to have a United 28 States Magistrate Judge conduct all further proceedings in this case, including trial and entry of final 1 judgment. Thereafter, the parties in Action 377 and Action 378 filed consent forms and both actions 2 || were reassigned to the undersigned. (Action 377, Doc. 21; Action 378, Doc. 18). 3 Conclusion and Order 4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: 5 1. Scott, et al. v. County of Kern, et al., Case No: 1:24-cv-00423-CDB, Scott, et al. v. Kern 6 County Hospital Authority, Case No. 1:25-cv-00378-CDB, and Estate of Stephen Ingle, et al. 7 Kern County Hospital Authority, Case No. 1:25-cv-00377-CDB, are CONSOLIDATED FOR 8 ALL PURPOSES. The case identified as Scott, et al. v. County of Kern, et al., Case No. 1:24 9 cv-00423-CDB, will be designated the lead case, and all further records and documents filed 1 10 the above-entitled actions shall be filed in Case No. 1:24-cv-00423-CDB. 11 2. A separate order will enter on the parties' pending stipulated request to reset case managemen 12 dates (Doc. 48). 13 || IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: _ June 4, 2025 | MannD br

15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28