| | Case3:05-cv-03110-SI D | ocument112 | Filed03/04/10 | Page1 of 4 |
|----------|--------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------------------------|
| | | | | |
| 1 | | | | |
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | |
| 5 | | | | |
| 6 | | | | |
| 7 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | |
| 8 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | | |
| 9 | | | | |
| 10 | JAMES TAYLOR, et al. | | No. C-04-4843 | 3 MHP |
| 11 | Plaintiffs, | | | |
| 12 | V. |) | | ATING CASES NG CLAIMS MISJOINED |
| 13 | CITY OF OAKLAND, et al. |) | | |
| 14 | Defendants. |) | | |
| 15 16 | JIMMY RIDER, et al. | | No. C-05-3204 | 4 MHP |
| 17 | Plaintiffs, |) | | |
| 18 | V. | | | |
| 19 | CITY OF OAKLAND, et al. | | | |
| 20 | Defendants. |) | | |
| 21 | DARNELL FOSTER AND CLASS | \overline{S} | No. C-05-3110 |) MHP |
| 22 | MEMBERS, et al., Plaintiffs, |) | | |
| 23 | V. | | | |
| 24 | CITY OF OAKLAND, et al. | | | |
| 25 | on ornario, a.a. | | | |
| 26 | Defendants. | | | |
| 27 | | | | |
| 28 | JOINT CAPTION CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE | | | |
| | | | | |

Case3:05-cv-03110-SI Document112 Filed03/04/10 Page2 of 4 TYRONE MOORE, et al. **No. C-**06-2426 MHP 1 2 Plaintiffs, 3 v. 4 CITY OF OAKLAND, et al. 5 Defendants. 6 JEFFRIE MILLER, et al. **No.** C-07-1773 MHP 7 Plaintiffs, 8 V. 9 CITY OF OAKLAND, et al. 10 11 Defendants. TERRELL TURNER, et al. 12 **No.** C-08-3114 MHP 13 Plaintiffs, 14 v. 15 CITY OF OAKLAND, et al. 16 Defendants. 17 LAWRENCE COLEY, et al. **No.** C-08-4255 MHP 18 Plaintiffs, 19 v. 20 CITY OF OAKLAND, et al. 21 22 Defendants. 23

The court has reviewed the filings in the foregoing cases referring particularly to C-08-4255 and C-09-5316. It appears that the latter action was related to the constellation of cases related to C-04-4843 by order dated February 17, 2010, but that the earlier of the two cases was not related although it had been assigned to this judge. Apparently no proposed order was submitted and no //

24

25

26

27

28

action was actually taken relating that case. Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that C-08-4255MHP is deemed related to C-04-4843MHP.

The court also notes in reviewing these two cases that a disturbing pattern seems to be emerging. Claims are being misjoined, for in both of these cases there are individuals making claims that although they may be related as to common questions of law, do not allege incidents occurring on the same date or involving the same facts, persons or officers. Each of the incidents complained of in these cases is separate and distinct.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 18(a) provides that "[a] party asserting a claim...may join...as many claims as *it* has against an opposing party." Whether claims are misjoined is governed by Rule 21 which adverts to Rule 20(a)(1) when determining whether separate persons may join in a single action. That rule states that such claims may be joined if "(A) they assert any right to relief jointly, severally, or in the alternative *with 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." These two conditions are in the conjunctive. Any claims failing to meet these conditions are "misjoined". The court finds that the claims in C-08-4255 and C-09-5316 are misjoined.

In accordance with Rule 21, the remedy may be the dropping of some of the parties from the complaint or the severance of claims. The court finds that the better procedure, since these plaintiffs should not all be joining in the same action, is for the court to give plaintiffs in these actions twenty (20) days to drop all but one of the plaintiffs in each of these actions and file new actions as to **each** of the dropped plaintiffs. The court will consider the dates of the original filings as being the dates of filings for the new actions. In other words, the statute of limitations is deemed tolled as of the date of original filing and will continue tolled until the new actions are filed, if they are filed within the twenty days or, if extended by the court, within the extended time.

//

Case3:05-cv-03110-SI Document112 Filed03/04/10 Page4 of 4

In the future, counsel for plaintiffs are instructed that any new actions shall comply with the preceding paragraphs. The court will not allow the joining of claims that do not meet the provisions of Rule 20(a)(1). THE FOREGOING IS SO ORDERED. Dated: March 3, 2010 MARILYN HALL PATEL United States District Court Judge