

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)