

**United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois**

<b>Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge</b>	Robert M. Dow, Jr.	<b>Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge</b>	
<b>CASE NUMBER</b>	10 C 1047	<b>DATE</b>	1/3/2011
<b>CASE TITLE</b>	The Moorish National Republic, et al. vs. City of Chicago, et al.		

**DOCKET ENTRY TEXT**

For the reasons stated below, Plaintiffs’ motion to consolidate related cases and joinder of claims [60] is denied. The notice of motion date of 1/5/2011 is stricken and no appearances are necessary on that date.

■ [ For further details see text below.]

Docketing to mail notices. Notices mailed by Judicial staff.  
\*Copy to judge/magistrate judge.

**STATEMENT**

Before the Court is Plaintiffs’ motion to consolidate related cases and joinder of claims [60], which is noticed for presentment on 1/5/2011. In their motion, Plaintiffs ask the Court to transfer to its docket two other federal cases (Case Nos. 10-cv-6536 and 10-cv-6796) and one state court case (DOC 09 248299) on the grounds that those three cases are related to Case No. 10-cv-1047, now pending before this Court.

Plaintiffs’ motion is not well taken. Having examined the docket sheets and dismissal orders, the Court notes that both federal cases have been terminated—one (Case No. 10-cv-6536) as a result of the denial of Plaintiffs’ motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and the other (Case No. 10-cv-6796) because the named defendant is immune from suit. Moreover, Plaintiffs’ motion fails to satisfy the criteria for reassignment of cases filed in this Court on the grounds of relatedness (see Local Rule 40.4) in any event. Finally, to the extent that Plaintiffs’ reference to “Case No. DOC 09 248299” is a case pending in state court, the Court is not aware of any provision that would allow for the transfer of a case from state to federal court on relatedness grounds, nor have Plaintiffs provided the Court with any provision or law supporting this proposition. The notice of motion date of 1/5/2011 is stricken and no appearances are necessary on that date. The Court also notes that Defendants have a reply brief due on their motion to dismiss [56] on 1/12/2011.