

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, TAMPA DIVISION**

**Joel Price v. The Individuals, Partnerships, and Unincorporated
Associations Identified on Schedule A**

Price · No. 8:25-cv-3398-KKM-AEP · Decided February 4, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida ordered Plaintiff Joel Price to show cause why all defendants except the first defendant listed on Schedule A should not be severed and dismissed. The order expressed concern that the alleged trademark infringement claims did not satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 20's requirements for permissive joinder because the complaint did not allege that the defendants were related or acted jointly.

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION
JOEL PRICE, Plaintiff, v. Case No. 8:25-cv-3398-KKM-AEP THE INDIVIDUALS,
PARTNERSHIPS, and UNINCORPORATED ASSOCIATIONS IDENTIFIED ON SCHEDULE
A., Defendants. _____ ORDER On December 12, 2025,
Plaintiff Joel Price filed this action alleging that 102 anonymous defendants are infringing his
trademark.

See Compl. (Doc. 1). Instead of identifying defendants by name, he filed Schedule A, (Doc. 2-1),
under seal, which lists them by their “Seller IDs.” See Mot. to Seal (Doc. 2) at 2. Upon review of
Schedule A and the allegations in the complaint, the Court is concerned that joinder of the
defendants might be improper.

The Court orders Price to show cause why the defendants—aside from the first defendant listed on
Schedule A—should not be severed and dismissed from this action. Federal Rule of Civil
Procedure 20 provides two requirements for joining defendants in a single action.

First, “any right to relief” must be “asserted against them jointly, severally, or in the alternative
with respect to or arising out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or
occurrences.” FED. R. CIV. P. 20(a)(2)(A).

Second, there must be a “question of law or fact common to all defendants [that] arise[s] in the
action.” Id. 20(a)(2)(B). “In determining what constitutes a transaction or occurrence for the
purposes of Rule 20(a), courts have looked for meaning to FED. R. CIV. P. 13(a) governing
compulsory counterclaims.” *Alexander v. Fulton Cnty., Ga.*, 207 F.3d 1303, 1323 (11th Cir.

2000), overruled on other grounds by *Manders v. Lee*, 338 F.3d 1304 (11th Cir. 2003); see also *Louis Vuitton Malletier v. Individuals, Bus. Entities, & Unincorporated Ass'ns Identified on Schedule "A,"* 2025 WL 2256518, at *1 (S.D. Fla. Feb. 28, 2025) (same). “[T]ransaction” is a “flexible” term, and “may comprehend a series of many occurrences, depending not so much upon the immediateness of their connection as upon their logical relationship.” *Alexander*, 207 F.3d at 1303 (quoting *Moore v. New York Cotton Exch.*, 270 U.S. 593, 610 (1926)).

Accordingly, courts ask whether “there is a logical relationship between the underlying operative facts and the claims brought.” *Louis Vuitton*, 2025 WL 2256518, at *1. A logical relationship exists between claims “when the same operative facts serve as the basis of both claims or the aggregate core of facts upon which the claim rests activates additional legal rights, otherwise dormant, in the defendant.” *Id.* (quoting *Republic Health Corp. v. Lifemark Hosps. of Fla., Inc.*, 755 F.2d 1453, 1455 (11th Cir.

1985) (per curiam)). The complaint does not allege that the defendants are related or acted jointly. The only commonalities that Price alleges in the filings are that the defendants violated the same trademark and some of the defendants’ products appear similar or identical. See Compl.; Sch. B (Doc. 2-2). But “[s]imply committing the same type of violation in the same way does not link defendants together for the purposes of joinder.” *Omega, SA v. Individuals, Bus.*

Entities, & Unincorporated Ass'ns Identified on Schedule "A," 650 F. Supp. 3d 1349, 1353 (S.D. Fla. 2023) (quoting *AF Holdings, LLC v. Does 1–1058*, 752 F.3d 990, 998 (D.C. Cir. 2014)). Price offers no authority to rebut the conclusion shared by many courts that “a plaintiff cannot satisfy Rule 20’s requirements merely by alleging that multiple defendants have infringed the same intellectual property.” *Tushbaby, Inc. v. Corps., Ltd. Liab.*

Cos., & Unincorporated Ass'ns Identified on Schedule A, 2024 WL 3741359, at *2 (S.D. Fla. Aug. 9, 2024) (collecting cases). In the light of these concerns, the following is ORDERED: 1. No later than February 6, 2026, Plaintiff Joel Price shall show cause why defendants—aside from the first Defendant on Schedule A—should not be severed and dismissed. ORDERED in Tampa, Florida, on February 4, 2026. ae 4 Mizelle United States District Judge