

No. 2:13 CV 16 DDN

alleged to have acted with the present plaintiffs. These considerations comply with Rule 20(a)(1)(B), but not the identity required by Rule 20(a)(1)(A).

Plaintiffs have not shown that Ms. Lonest's claim arises out of the *same* occurrence or transaction, or series of such, that gave rise to their claims. F. R. Civ. P. 20(a)(1)(A). At best, plaintiffs have shown that Ms. Lonest's claim arises from a similar occurrence or series of events, but not the same one. Whether Ms. Lonest's claim is part of the same "transaction" in which the present plaintiffs' claims occurred requires consideration of whether the claims are "logically related." In re Prempro Products Liability Litigation, 591 F.3d 613, 622-23 (8th Cir. 2010). The record before the court indicates only that Ms. Lonest's claim is based on the same law and involves the same defendant actor. Defendants argue that neither of the present plaintiffs has testified that defendant Isgrig's actions with them involved Ms. Lonest. (Doc. 71.)

Plaintiffs have not shown entitlement under Rule 20 for the joinder of Ms. Lonest's claim. This is not to say that her claim would not qualify for joinder with more information about it. The court will deny the motion to add Ms. Lonest's claim without prejudice. Plaintiffs may refile the motion with a proposed amended complaint that demonstrates entitlement to joinder. Nelson v. Rosenbloom, 2008 WL 554300 (E.D. Mo. 2008).

Therefore,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the motion of plaintiffs to add the claim of Sondra Lonest (Doc. 70) is denied without prejudice. Plaintiffs may have 21 days to renew this motion with a proposed amended complaint attached.

/s/ David D. Noce

**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Signed on October 16, 2014.