

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

6

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

7

8

9

Tom Bean,

)

CV 11-08028-PCT-FJM

10

Plaintiff,

)

ORDER

11

vs.

)

12

John Wiley & Sons, Inc.,

)

13

Defendant.

)

14

15

16

The court has before it plaintiff's motion to transfer Bean v. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.,
CV-12-08001-PCT-GMS, to our docket (doc. 99). No party filed a response, and the time
for responding has expired.

19

In deciding whether to transfer a related case under LRCiv 42.1, we consider whether
matters of substance have been considered in a case, whether a particular judge has the most
familiarity with the relevant issues, and whether a case can be reasonably viewed as the lead
case. Here, plaintiff argues that his recently filed action involves the identical parties and the
same types of copyright infringement claims as those in this action. Although both actions
allege copyright infringement by defendant's use of plaintiff's photographs in textbooks, there
is nothing so unique about these actions that would make us any more equipped than any
other judge in this district to adjudicate plaintiff's claims. Additionally, there is a fully-
briefed motion to dismiss pending in the action plaintiff wishes us to transfer. In sum, there
are not compelling reasons to transfer plaintiff's recently-filed action.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26


27

28

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

IT IS ORDERED DENYING plaintiff's motion to transfer related case CV-12-08001-PCT-GMS (doc. 99).

DATED this 14th day of March, 2012.



Frederick J. Martone
United States District Judge