

(finding that six cases shared “common factual issues and ar[o]se out of a common event or transaction” where each case raised identical challenges to the same regulation).

Plaintiffs’ objections to the contrary are unavailing. First, Plaintiffs note that, at the time Plaintiffs filed the instant case, the complaint in *Gomez* had not been amended to include challenges pertaining to the 2020 diversity visa program. *See* Pls.’ Objection to Defs.’ Notice of Related Cases, ECF No. 19 [hereinafter Pls.’ Opp’n], at 13–14. But Plaintiffs identify nothing in Local Rule 40.5 that limits the relatedness inquiry to the time when a case was first filed, nor would such a rule serve the interests of judicial economy.

Second, Plaintiffs assert that because the claims in *Gomez* also pertain to other visa categories, that case is “too broad” for a related case designation to conserve judicial resources. *Id.* at 14–15. However, a case “need not present entirely identical factual issues and legal claims to be sufficiently related.” *Comm. on Judiciary v. McGahn*, 391 F. Supp. 3d 116, 122 (D.D.C. 2019). As both cases’ APA challenges to Defendants’ processing and issuance of 2020 diversity visas are substantially similar, designating the two cases as related furthers judicial economy by avoiding the necessity of multiple judges having to familiarize themselves with these overlapping issues, even if both cases may also raise separate issues that do not overlap.

Finally, Plaintiffs suggest that this case is not related to *Gomez* because, unlike the *Gomez* plaintiffs, they allege that the adjudications of their visas have been unreasonably delayed. Pls.’ Opp’n at 16. But Plaintiffs’ allegations that their visas have been unreasonably delayed are predicated on their APA claim that Defendants have arbitrarily and unlawfully refused to process and issue diversity visas pursuant to Proclamations 10014 and 10052. *See* Pls.’ Am. Compl., ECF No. ¶¶ 2200–2210; Pls.’ Mem. in Supp. of Mot. for Prelim. Inj., ECF No. 8-1, at 20. That issue is common to both cases.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Amit Mehta". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "A" and a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Dated: August 3, 2020

Amit P. Mehta
United States District Court Judge