

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Parker v. Zoox, Inc.

Parker · No. 2:25-cv-02513-JAD-EJY · Decided January 23, 2026

OPINION

Parker

PER CURIAM.

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 * * * 4 TAMEKA L. PARKER, Case No. 2:25-cv-02513-JAD-EJY 5 Plaintiff,

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT and

6 v. RECOMMENDATION

7 ZOOX, INC.,

ECF No. 4 8 Defendant. 9 On 12/29/25, the magistrate judge entered this report and recommendation [ECF No. 4]: 10 Pending before the Court is an instant action titled Parker v. Zoox, Inc. The content of the 11 Complaint in this matter (ECF No. 1-1) is an exact duplicate of the content in the Complaint 12 proceeding before Judges Boulware and Koppe. See Case No. 2:25-cv-1898-RFB-NJK (the “1898 13 Matter”), ECF No. 9. 14 “Plaintiffs generally have no right to maintain two separate actions involving the same 15 subject matter at the same time in the same court and against the same defendant.” Adams v. Cal. 16 Dept. of Health Servs., 487 F.3d 684, 688 (9th Cir. 2007), overruled on other grounds by Taylor v. 17 Sturgell, 553 U.S. 880 (2008), (cleaned up) (quoting Walton v. Eaton Corp., 563 F.2d 66, 70 (3d 18 Cir. 1977)). “Two actions are in the ‘same court’ within the meaning of the claim-splitting doctrine 19 when both were filed in federal court.” Almaznai v. S-L Distr. Co., Case No. 20-cv-08487-JST, 2021 20 WL 4457025, at *5 n.5 (N.D. Cal. June 21, 2021). 21 What is undeniable is that the substance of the Complaint in this case duplicates the substance 22 of the Complaint in the 1898 Matter. The cases are brought by the same Plaintiff (Tameka Parker) 23 against the same Defendant (Zoox) in the same court (the U.S. District Court for the District of 24 Nevada). Given these facts, the Court finds permitting the instant matter to proceed would be 25 contrary to well settled law. 26 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that Plaintiff’s Complaint in Parker v. 27 Zoox, Case No. 25-cv-2513-JAD-EJY be dismissed and this action be closed in its entirety.] IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that any filings submitted bearing the case number 2 || this action be redirected to Case No. 25-cv-1898. 3 Dated this 29th day of December, 2025. 5 .

ELAYNA J. YO A

6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

8 ORDER

9 The deadline for any party to object to this recommendation was 1/12/26, and no 10 || party filed anything or asked to extend the deadline to do so. “[N]o review is required of a 11 || magistrate judge’s report and recommendation unless objections are filed.” United States v. 12 || Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). Having reviewed the report and 13 || recommendation, I find good cause to adopt it, and I do. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that th 14 || Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 4] is ADOPTED in its entirety, and 15 || THIS CASE IS DISMISSED for the reasons stated in the report and recommendation. The Clet 16 || of Court is directed to CLOSE THIS CASE. Plaintiff Tameka L. Parker is advised that any 17 || further filings related to her claims against Zoox, Inc. must be filed in Case No. 25-cv-1898- 18 || RFB-NJK instead. Lee 71 Dated: January 23, 2026 22 23 24 25 26 27 28