

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.

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

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/scott-v-county-of-kern-c1e0715a>