



courts, however, have addressed the issue. See *Burke v. Helman*, 208 F.R.D. 246 (C.D. Illinois 2002)(collecting cases). In *Hubbard v. Haley*, 262 F.3d 1194 (11th Cir. 2001), the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit held that multiple prisoners may not join in one action or one appeal.

Additionally, each plaintiff's claims are unique to the particular plaintiff. Any damages, if awarded, would need to be determined individually. Furthermore, the court may be presented with a situation where some plaintiffs have complied with the exhaustion requirement of the PLRA and others have not. See 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a) ("No action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under section 1983 of this title, or any other Federal law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility until such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted"). Just as payment of one fee does not cover multiple plaintiffs under the PLRA, exhaustion of administrative remedies by one prisoner does not meet the exhaustion requirement for all of the plaintiffs. Each individual plaintiff is required to comply with the exhaustion requirement. See *Porter v. Nussle*, 534 U.S. 516, 524 (2002)(exhaustion is required in all actions brought with respect to prison conditions); *Woodford v. Ngo*, 548 U.S. 81, 85 (2006)(PLRA makes "proper" exhaustion mandatory). Finally, each plaintiff must be notified separately of court documents, orders, and deadlines. See *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309, 310 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1975).

As a result, the court concludes that each plaintiffs' claims will require individualized determinations. Accordingly, the Clerk of Court is directed to assign separate civil action numbers to the three (3) other inmates whose signatures appear on the complaint.

The defendants in the new cases will be the same defendants listed in the above-captioned case. The Clerk of Court is authorized to re-file the complaint from the above-captioned matter in the new cases. Thus, the initial document entries on the docket in the three additional cases will be this order and the original complaint. The Clerk of Court is authorized to determine the most efficient way and time for assigning case numbers, and entering the new case numbers, party information, and pleading information on the court's electronic case management system. In the above-captioned case and in the three new cases, each plaintiff will have the benefit of the "prison mail-box rule". See *Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266 (1988). In the above-captioned case, Sean M. Northrop will remain as the sole plaintiff.

After the new cases are docketed, the assigned Magistrate Judge is authorized to issue orders pursuant to the General Order, *In Re: Procedures in Civil Actions Filed by Prisoner Pro Se Litigants*, 3:07-mc-5014-JFA (D.S.C. Sept. 18, 2007), and conduct initial reviews in compliance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**



Richard M. Gergel  
United States District Judge

Charleston, South Carolina  
October 21, 2010