

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA**

**Stuart Eggertsen v. Henrik Fisker**

No. 2:25-cv-00236-FLA (KSx), United States District Court for the Central District of California (March 21,  
2025)

---

**OPINION**

Stuart Eggertsen v. Henrik Fisker

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 STUART EGGERTSEN, Case No. 2:25-cv-00236-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 FISKER, FISKER, ET AL., 2:24-CV-09760-FLA

(KSX)

16 Defendant. 17

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.” *Invs. 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”) outweighs any potential for 14 | delay, confusion, and prejudice, as each action asserts  
the same claims against similar 15 | defendants. 16 Accordingly, the parties are ORDERED TO  
SHOW CAUSE in writing only 17 | within fourteen (14) days of this Order why this action should  
not be consolidated 18 || with the Jenetopulos Action. Responses shall be limited to five (5) pages

in length. 19 | Failure to respond may result in consolidation of the actions without further notice.  
20 21 IT IS SO ORDERED. 22 23 | Dated: March 21, 2025  
04 FERNANDO L. AENLLE-ROCHA  
United States District Judge 25 26 27 28

---

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2025/stuart-eggertsen-v-henrik-fisker-h5i95whc>