UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Charmaine Chua et al v. PLAINTIFF(S) City of Los Angeles et al DEFENDANT(S).	CASE NUMBER 2:16-cv-00237 JAK(GJSx) ORDER RE TRANSFER PURSUANT TO GENERAL ORDER 14-03 (RELATED CASES)

CONSENT

I hereby consent to the transfer of the above-entitled case to my calendar, pursuant to General Order 14-03.

Date

United States District Judge

DECLINATION

I hereby decline to transfer the above-entitled case to my calendar for the reasons set forth:

See attachment.

September 23, 2016
Date

/s/ Fernando M. Olguin
United States District Judge

REASON FOR TRANSFER AS INDICATED BY COUNSEL

Case 2:16-cv-00216 FMO(AFMx) and the present case:

- ☑ A. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings or events; or
- ☑ B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or
- ☑ C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or
- ☐ D. Involve one or more defendants from the criminal case in common, and would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges (applicable only on civil forfeiture action).

NOTICE TO COUNSEL FROM CLERK

Pursuant to the above transfer, any discovery maters that are or may be referred to a Magistrate Judge are hereby transferred from Magistrate Judge _____ to Magistrate Judge _____.

On all documents subsequently filed in this case, please substitute the initials _____ after the case number in place of the initials of the prior judge, so that the case number will read _____. This is very important because the documents are routed to the assigned judges by means of these initials

cc: ☐ *Previous Judge* ☐ *Statistics Clerk*

Charmaine Chua, et al. v. City of Los Angeles, CV 16-0237 JAK (GJSx)

Although Case No. CV 16-0216 and Case No. CV 16-0237 may be related, these cases, as well as Case No. CV 16-1187, were informally consolidated and referred to Magistrate Judge Gail J. Standish for a global settlement conference. See Semhar Girmay Amha v. City of Los Angeles, et al., CV 16-0216 FMO (AFMx) (Dkt. 18, Court's Order of May 12, 2016). Also, the posture of Case No. CV 16-0237, is far more advanced than Case No. CV 16-0216. For example, Case No. 16-0237 is already at the class certification stage. Given how far along Case No. CV 16-0237 is at this time, it would be a waste of judicial resources to transfer Case No. CV 16-0237 to the undersigned. Finally, plaintiff's counsel in Case No. CV 16-0237 does not explain why they waited nine months to file the Notice of Related Case.