

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE Northern District of Illinois – CM/ECF NextGen 1.7.1.1
Eastern Division**

Watts Coordinated Pretrial Proceedings, et
al.

v.

Kallatt Mohammed, et al.

Plaintiff,

Case No.: 1:19-cv-01717
Honorable Franklin U.
Valderrama

Defendant.

NOTIFICATION OF DOCKET ENTRY

This docket entry was made by the Clerk on Friday, February 9, 2024:

MINUTE entry before the Honorable Franklin U. Valderrama: The Court asked the parties to file a status report setting forth their positions on whether cases involving co-arrestees (and specifically, 18-cv-05120, Gipson and the five co-arrestee cases) should be consolidated for trial, and if so, how such a consolidated trial would be conducted in a manageable way [648]. The Court indicated that its initial impression was that trying all co-arrestee cases would be unmanageable, as there were no common operative facts amongst said cases. The Court has reviewed the parties' status report [664]. In the status report, Plaintiffs state that they do not oppose trying the Gipson case (18-cv-01520) on its own. Defendants' position, on the other hand, is that the Gipson case should be consolidated for trial along with the five co-arrestee cases (Coleman (19-cv-01094), Giles (21-cv-4798), Lomax (19-cv-01095), Ollie (19-cv-00131), and Roberts (22-cv-00674)). Defendants posit that the six cases arise from the same set of operative facts, have the same police officer defendants (with some limited exceptions), and have substantial overlap of most fact and expert witnesses. Defendants attached the Vice Case Report setting forth the January 4, 2003 narcotics operation that led to the six arrests, which they argue supports consolidating these cases for trial. R. 664-1. However, the Court's careful review of the six complaints at issue, reveals that the facts underlying each arrest, and the facts for each case after the arrests themselves are disparate (e.g., Lomax alleges he was beaten by Defendants and they stole his cash, but no other co-arrestee alleges being physically harmed or having property stolen in the same way; Gipson and Coleman were arrested in their cars outside the Ida B. Wells complex, whereas the other four co-arrestees were arrested in or around the Ida B. Wells apartment; Gipson filed a motion to suppress evidence related to his January 2003 arrest whereas no other co-arrestee filed a motion to suppress). The Court acknowledges that trying the six cases together would serve some economies; however, based on the information before the Court, Defendants have not caused the Court to change its initial impression that trying the six-arrestee cases would be unmanageable. Accordingly, the Court orders that 18-cv-05120, Gipson v. City of Chicago et al will not be consolidated for trial with the five co-arrestee cases. The Court does not address the parties' positions as to whether Gipson's three arrests should be tried together, as that is a matter properly before Judge

Seeger, the trial judge (as Defendants indicate in the status report). Mailed notice (ags)

ATTENTION: This notice is being sent pursuant to Rule 77(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or Rule 49(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. It was generated by CM/ECF, the automated docketing system used to maintain the civil and criminal dockets of this District. If a minute order or other document is enclosed, please refer to it for additional information.

For scheduled events, motion practices, recent opinions and other information, visit our web site at www.ilnd.uscourts.gov.