

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID TANGIPA, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GAVIN NEWSOM, in his official capacity
as the Governor of California, *et al.*,

Defendants.

2:25-cv-10616-JLS-WLH-KKL
2:25-cv-11480-JLS-WLH-KKL

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE:
CONSOLIDATION**

MITCH NOYES, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GAVIN NEWSOM, in his official capacity
as the Governor of California, *et al.*,

Defendants.

1 Pending before this Court are *Tangipa v. Newsom*, No. 2:25-cv-10616-JLS-WLH-
2 KKL and *Noyes v. Newsom*, No. 2:25-cv-11480-JLS-WLH-KKL. As stated in the Notice
3 of Related Case (Doc. 6) filed by Plaintiffs in *Noyes*:

4 Both cases challenge the constitutionality and legality of
5 California's new Congressional redistricting plan (adopted
6 through Proposition 50). The *Tangipa* Plaintiffs, along with the
7 United States as Plaintiff-Intervenor, challenge the Proposition
8 50 map under the Fifteenth Amendment to the United States
9 Constitution and the Voting Rights Act, just as the Plaintiffs in
10 *Noyes* have done. These cases therefore 'arise from the same ...
happening or event,' and 'call for determination of the same or
substantially related ... questions of law and fact': The Court's
core task in both cases is identical.

11 (Doc. 6 at 2.) Accordingly, the parties are ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE as to
12 why these two cases should not be consolidated for all future proceedings. The responses
13 to this Order should not exceed five pages each and are to be filed no later than **February**
14 **27, 2026**.

15 All pending motions are STAYED until this Court has ruled on consolidation.

16
17 DATED: February 17, 2026

18
19 HON. JOSEPHINE L. STATON
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

21
22 HON. KENNETH K. LEE
23 UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

24
25 HON. WESLEY L. HSU
26 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE