

18 multiple defendants into one action if "(A) any right to relief is asserted against them ... arising out 19 of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences; and (B) any question of 20 law or fact common to all defendants will arise in the action." Fed. R. Civ. P. 20(a)(2). When 21 determining whether defendants are joined properly, the court should "liberally construe[] [the 22 requirements] in the interest of convenience and judicial economy in a manner that will secure the 23 just, speedy, and inexpensive termination of the action." Call of the Wild Movie, LLC v. Does 1-24 1,062, No. 10-455, 2011 WL 996786 (D.D.C. Mar. 22, 2011) (citation & quotation marks omitted); 25 see United Mine Workers of Am. v. Gibbs, 383 U.S. 715, 724 (1966); Diabolic Video Prods., Inc., 26 No. 10-CV-5865, at *5. If defendants do not satisfy the test for permissive joinder, the court may 27 sever the misjoined parties, "so long as no substantial right will be prejudiced by the severance." 28

Coughlin v. Rogers, 130 F.3d 1348, 1350 (9th Cir. 1997) (citation omitted); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 21 ("Misjoinder of parties is not a ground for dismissing an action."). The claims that Plaintiff brings against Defendants Mary Shapiro, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the United States stem from issues of law and fact distinct from the claims asserted against other defendants. In the interest of convenience and judicial economy, the court therefore orders that these parties be severed from this case. IT IS SO ORDERED. IT IS SO ORDEREI M. Ry Dated: January 5, 2012 DONNA M. RYU United States Magistrate Judge

United States District Court For the Northern District of California