

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Student Does Nos. 1-42 v. Kristi Noem, et al.

Student Does · No. CV 25-4113-JFW(MARx) · Decided May 16, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered the plaintiffs to show cause why one or more of them should not be severed for improper joinder under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 20(a). The court required a written response by May 20, 2025 and warned that failure to respond would result in dismissal of the action.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John F. Walter
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	May 16, 2025
DOCKET	CV 25-4113-JFW(MARx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause why one or more plaintiffs should not be severed for improper joinder under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 20(a).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; interlocutory order to show cause
PARTIES	Student Does Nos. 1-42 v. Kristi Noem, et al.

TOPICS

joinder civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the plaintiffs were improperly joined under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 20(a).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Rule 20(a) imposes two specific requirements for proper joinder: “(1) a right to relief must be asserted by . . . each plaintiff. . . relating to or arising out of the same transaction or occurrence; and (2) some question of law or fact common to all the parties will arise in the action.”” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The document provides no substantive facts concerning the plaintiffs' underlying claims. The court's concern was that the forty-two named plaintiffs may not satisfy the requirements for permissive joinder because their claims may not arise from the same transaction or occurrence and may not present common questions of law or fact.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs brought this federal action against Kristi Noem and others. The court questioned whether the plaintiffs were properly joined and ordered them to respond in writing by May 20, 2025. The court stated that failure to respond would result in dismissal of the action.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- League to Save Lake Tahoe v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, 558 F.2d 914, 917 (9th Cir. 1977)
- Coughlin v. Rogers, 130 F.3d 1348, 1350 (9th Cir. 1997)

OPINION

Student Does v. Kristi Noem

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES -- GENERAL

Case No. CV 25-4113-JFW(MARx) Date: May 16, 2025 Title: Student Does Nos. 1-42 -v- Kristi Noem, et al. PRESENT:

HONORABLE JOHN F. WALTER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Shannon Reilly None Present Courtroom Deputy Court Reporter ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PLAINTIFFS: ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR DEFENDANTS: None None

PROCEEDINGS (IN CHAMBERS): ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: IMPROPER JOINDER

The Court hereby orders Plaintiffs to show cause, in writing, no later than May 20, 2025, why one or more Plaintiffs should not be severed from this action as a result of improper joinder. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 20(a), which allows for permissive joinder, provides, in pertinent part:

(1) Plaintiffs. Persons may join in one action as plaintiffs if:

(A) they assert any right to relief jointly, severally, or in the alternative in respect to or arising out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences; and (B) any question of law or fact common to all plaintiffs will arise in the action. Fed. R. Civ. P. 20(a). Rule 20(a) imposes two specific requirements for proper joinder: “(1) a right to relief must be asserted by . . . each plaintiff . . . relating to or arising out of the same transaction or occurrence; and (2) some question of law or fact common to all the parties will arise in the action.” *League to Save Lake Tahoe v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency*, 558 F.2d 914, 917 (9th Cir. 1977). “The first prong, the ‘same transaction’ requirement, refers to similarity in the factual background of a claim.” *Coughlin v. Rogers*, 130 F.3d 1348, 1350 (9th Cir. 1997). No oral argument on this matter will be heard unless otherwise ordered by the Court. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 78; Local Rule 7-15. The Order will stand submitted upon the filing of the response to the Order to Show Cause. Failure to respond to the Order to Show Cause will result in the dismissal of this action. IT IS SO ORDERED.