



“The copyright infringement claims did not arise out of the same transaction, occurrence or series of transactions or occurrence . . . because “each defendant used the same ISP as well as some of the same P2P networks. . . . [M]erely committing the same type of violation in the same way does not link defendants together for purposes of joinder.” *Hard Drive Productions, Inc. v. Does 1-188*, 809 F. Supp. 2d 1150, 1157 (N.D.Cal. 2011). While “[misjoinder of parties is not a ground for dismissing an action, [o]n motion or on its own, the court may at any time, on just terms, add or drop a party. The court may also sever any claim against a party.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 21.

With these rules in mind, the Court orders TDF to show cause, within the next 14 days, why it should not exercise its discretion under Rule 21 to sever all of the Doe defendants but one, while permitting TDF to refile against each of the defendants in separate actions.

**So Ordered.**

/s/ F. Dennis Saylor  
F. Dennis Saylor IV  
United States District Judge

Dated: September 26, 2012