

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  
Northern District of California

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

IN RE GOOGLE DIGITAL  
ADVERTISING ANTITRUST  
LITIGATION

Case No. 20-cv-03556-BLF

Case No. 20-cv-08984-BLF

Case No. 20-cv-09092-BLF

Case No. 20-cv-09321-BLF

Case No. 21-cv-00022-BLF

SWEEPSTAKES TODAY, LLC,  
Plaintiff,

Case No. 21-cv-00748-BLF

v.

Case No. 21-cv-00810-BLF

GOOGLE LLC, et al.,  
Defendants.

**ORDER CONSOLIDATING CASES**

GENIUS MEDIA GROUP, INC., et al.,  
Plaintiffs,

v.

ALPHABET INC., et al.,  
Defendants.

STERLING INTERNATIONAL  
CONSULTING GROUP,  
Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,  
Defendant.

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

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

MARK J. ASTARITA,  
Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE LLC, et al.,  
Defendants.

---

JLASALLE ENTERPRISES LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,  
Defendant.

---

MIKULA WEB SOLUTIONS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,  
Defendant.

On March 2, 2021, the Court issued an order to show cause why the following publisher plaintiff cases should not be consolidated:

- *Sweepstakes Today, LLC v. Google, LLC, et al.*, 20-cv-08984
- *Genius Media Group, Inc., et al. v. Google, LLC, et al.*, 20-cv-09092
- *Sterling International Consulting Group v. Google LLC*, 20-cv-09321
- *Astarita v. Google LLC, et al.*, 21-cv-00022
- *JLaSalle Enterprises LLC v. Google LLC*, 21-cv-00748
- *Mikula Web Solutions, Inc. v. Google LLC*, 21-cv-00810

ECF 110. The parties jointly filed a non-opposition to consolidation on March 10, 2021. ECF 113.

“If actions before the court involve a common question of law or fact, the court may . . . consolidate the actions.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a). The “district court has broad discretion under this

1 for *Cent. Dist. of California*, 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir. 1989). “In determining whether or not to  
2 consolidate cases, the Court should weigh the interest of judicial convenience against the potential  
3 for delay, confusion and prejudice.” *Bodri v. Gopro, Inc.*, 2016 WL 1718217, at \*1 (N.D. Cal.  
4 Apr. 28, 2016) (quoting *Zhu v. UCBH Holdings, Inc.*, 682 F. Supp. 2d 1049, 1052 (N.D. Cal.  
5 2010)).

6 In light of the parties’ consensus and the common questions of law and fact in the relevant  
7 cases, the Court CONSOLIDATES the publisher cases for all purposes, including trial and  
8 dispositive motions. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that:

- 9 (1) The Clerk of Court shall administratively consolidate Case Nos. 20-cv-08984, 20-cv-  
10 09092, 20-cv-09321, 21-cv-00022, 21-cv-00748, and 21-cv-00810.
- 11 (2) The master docket and master file for the consolidated actions shall be Case No. 20-cv-  
12 08984 and the consolidated action shall bear the caption *In re Google Digital Publisher*  
13 *Antitrust Litigation*. The remaining cases shall be administratively closed.
- 14 (3) All orders, pleadings, motions, and other documents shall, when filed and docketed in  
15 the master file, be deemed filed and docketed in each individual case to the extent  
16 applicable.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18  
19 Dated: March 10, 2021

20   
21 BETH LABSON FREEMAN  
22 United States District Judge  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28