

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

MONTEZ GUYTON,)	Case No.: 5:11-CV-05701 EJD
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
)	JOINDER
v.)	
)	(Re: Docket No. 2)
FACEBOOK INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

Before the court is Plaintiff’s Motion for Joinder pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 20(a)(1). For the reasons discussed below, the motion is DENIED.

I. BACKGROUND

On November 28, 2011, Plaintiff filed the Complaint in this action. Also on November 28, 2011, Plaintiff filed this Motion for Joinder.

On December 12, 2011, Defendant Facebook, Inc. filed a motion to relate this case to a class action that is also before this court, Davis, et al. v. Facebook, Case No. 11-CV-04834 EJD. On December 14, 2011 the court determined that this case was not related to the class action.

On January 11, 2012, the court determined that this case is related to the following cases: 11-CV-5699, 11-CV-6367, 11-CV-5700, 11-CV-5763, 11-CV-5764. On January 26, 2012, the court determined that case number 11-CV-06445 is also related to these six cases.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

II. LEGAL STANDARDS

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 20(a)(1), persons may join in one action as plaintiffs 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.

III. DISCUSSION

The court is unable to determine from Plaintiff’s motion what joinder Plaintiff seeks. Plaintiff’s motion states that Plaintiff “makes this request for joinder in this controversy, due to the efficiency it would provide to this Court and the related claim within the class action already in dispute against Facebook Inc.” Docket No. 2. Plaintiff, however, has not identified any additional plaintiffs to join in this action. Thus, Plaintiff has not provided sufficient information to the court to demonstrate that the requirements of Rule 20(a)(1) are satisfied. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion for joinder is DENIED.

Dated: February 7, 2012


EDWARD J. DAVILA
United States District Judge