

United States District Court Northern District of California United States District Court 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

(ii) leave an existing party subject to a substantial risk of incurring double, multiple, or otherwise inconsistent obligations because of the interest.

Additionally, the Ninth Circuit interprets Rule 19 to require joinder even when there is no cause of action between plaintiff and a party sought to be joined. E.E.O.C. v. Peabody W. Coal Co., 400 F.3d 774, 781 (9th Cir. 2005). If "[j]oinder is necessary for the 'sole purpose' of effecting complete relief between the parties," then the Court must order joinder of the required party. Id. at 781.

Therefore, SN Servicing must explain why Seneca Mortgaging Services, LLC is not a necessary party in this action by August 17, 2015. If Western Bancorp wishes, it may also explain by August 17, 2015, why it would support or oppose court-ordered joinder of Seneca Mortgaging Services, LLC. The parties should be prepared to discuss the issue further at the August 19, 2015, case management conference.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 11, 2015

NATHANAEL M. COUSINS United States Magistrate Judge

Case No.:14-cv-04978-NC

2