

1  
2  
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
4 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
5 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**  
6

7 NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR GUN  
8 RIGHTS, INC., et al.,

9 Plaintiffs,

10 v.

11 CITY OF SAN JOSE, et al.,

12 Defendants.

13 HOWARD JARVIS TAXPAYERS  
14 ASSOCIATION, et al.,

15 Plaintiffs,

16 v.

17 CITY OF SAN JOSE,

18 Defendant.

Case No. 22-cv-00501-BLF

**ORDER CONSOLIDATING RELATED  
CASES**

Case No. 22-cv-02365-BLF

19 On April 20, 2022, the Court issued Orders to Show Cause Why Cases Should Not Be  
20 Consolidated in both of the above referenced cases. Order to Show Cause, No. 22-cv-00501-BLF,  
21 ECF No. 52; Order to Show Cause, No. 22-cv-02365-BLF, ECF No. 6.

22 Plaintiffs National Association for Gun Rights, Inc. and Mark Sikes (collectively, “NAGR  
23 Plaintiffs”) have not opposed consolidation, so long as it does not delay the Court’s decision on  
24 their motion for preliminary injunction, which the Court has already issued. *See* NAGR Pls.’  
25 Response to Order to Show Cause, No. 22-cv-00501, ECF No. 54. Plaintiffs in Case No. 22-cv-  
26 02365 (“HJTA Plaintiffs”) have objected to consolidation to the extent it would add delay and  
27 expense to their case by requiring an evidentiary trial. *See* HJTA Pls.’ Response to Order to Show  
28 Cause, No. 22-cv-02365, ECF No. 15. Defendants in both cases have not opposed consolidation


1 and take the position that the cases should be consolidated for all purposes. *See* Defs.’ Response  
2 to Order to Show Cause, No. 22-cv-00501, ECF No. 53; Response to Order to Show Cause, No.  
3 22-cv-02365, ECF No. 14.

4 “If actions before the court involve a common question of law or fact, the court may . . .  
5 consolidate the actions.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a). The “district court has broad discretion under this  
6 rule to consolidate cases pending in the same district.” *Investors Research Co. v. U.S. Dist. Court*  
7 *for Cent. Dist. of California*, 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir. 1989). Here, these two cases share  
8 several common questions of both law and fact. Both NAGR Plaintiffs and HJTA Plaintiffs assert  
9 claims arising under the First Amendment and article XIII C of the California Constitution. *See*  
10 First Amended Complaint (“NAGR Compl.”) ¶¶ 106-115, 122-133, No. 22-cv-00501, ECF No.  
11 19; Complaint (“HJTA Compl.”) ¶¶ 9-19, 24-31, No. 22-cv-02365, ECF No. 1. More broadly,  
12 both sets of plaintiffs seek to enjoin or invalidate portions of the City of San Jose’s recent gun  
13 harm ordinance. *See* NAGR Compl., at 25; HJTA Compl., at 8. Regarding HJTA Plaintiffs’  
14 concerns of delays from an evidentiary trial, they are free to seek relief and accommodation under  
15 a consolidated case should the need arise; however, these concerns do not outweigh the substantial  
16 administrative benefits from consolidation at the present stage in the proceedings, given these  
17 cases’ significant overlap.

18 Accordingly, the Court CONSOLIDATES Case Nos. 22-cv-00501 and 22-cv-02365 for all  
19 purposes. For administrative purposes, the docket in the later-filed case, No. 22-cv-02365, shall  
20 be closed.

21 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

22 Dated: September 30, 2022

23   
24 BETH LABSON FREEMAN  
25 United States District Judge  
26  
27  
28