

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF DELAWARE

ABDULLAH, MILANDO, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civ. Act. No. N25C-03-277 DJB
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

AGYEAH, GEORGE, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civ. Act. No. N25C-03-280 DJB
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

ALFORD, LAURA, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civ. Act. No. N25C-03-267 DJB
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

ALMOND, LATESHA, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civ. Act. No. N25C-03-271 DJB
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
ALT, DELBERT, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civ. Act. No. N25C-03-270 DJB
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
ANDREWS, TIMOTHY, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civ. Act. No. N25C-03-239 DJB
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
ATKINS, JOSEPH, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civ. Act. No. N25C-03-273 DJB
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

CEPHAS, DONIS, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civ. Act. No. N25C-03-279 DJB
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
CORBIN, MICHAEL, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civ. Act. No. N25C-03-248 DJB
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
DRUMMOND, DOMINQUE, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civ. Act. No. N25C-03-249 DJB
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
MCGINNIS, MARTIA, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civ. Act. No. N25C-03-256 DJB
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

MCKINNEY, FRANCES, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civ. Act. No. N25C-03-257 DJB
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
MOORE, DANIEL, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civ. Act. No. N25C-03-262 DJB
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
MURRAY, ERIC, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civ. Act. No. N25C-03-258 DJB
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
MURRAY, SHERRY, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civ. Act. No. N25C-03-263 DJB
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

VANDERVELDE, MARY, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civ. Act. No. N25C-03-278 DJB
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

Date Submitted: May 29, 2026
Date Decided: August 31, 2026
Amended: September 3, 2026

Memorandum Opinion

On Defendant's Omnibus Motion to Sever – **GRANTED**, in part and **DENIED**, in part.

Antranig Garibian, Esquire, Garibian Law Offices, P.C., Wilmington, Delaware; *Eric D. Pearson, Esquire*, and *Charles W. Miller, Esquire*, Heygood, Orr & Pearson, Irving, Texas, (admitted *pro hac vice*); attorneys for Plaintiffs.

Christian J. Singewald, Esquire, and *Daryll Hawthorne-Bernardo, Esquire*, White and Williams LLP, Wilmington, Delaware; *Robert Wise, Esquire*, Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough LLP, Richmond, Virginia, (admitted *pro hac vice* in Timothy Andrews, et al. v. Ford Motor Company, C.A., No. N25C-03-239 DJB); attorneys for Defendant.

BRENNAN, J.

On March 21, 2025, approximately 1,358 Plaintiffs (hereinafter and collectively, “Plaintiffs”) filed the named sixteen (16) separate actions against Defendant, Ford Motor Company (hereinafter “Ford”), asserting breach of warranty and fraud claims arising from their individual purchases of Ford vehicles equipped with “6F35” transmissions.¹ Each Plaintiff makes claims regarding the failure of these transmissions in either a Ford Focus or Escape vehicles, and resulting damages. Not all Plaintiffs are similarly situated, despite raising similar claims. Some Plaintiffs purchased their respective vehicles, some leased, vehicles were acquired in different states, and various model years are aggrieved.

Pending before the Court is Ford’s Omnibus Motion to Sever.² While the sixteen complaints attempt to logically organize similarly situated plaintiffs, more can be done to fully achieve compliance with Superior Court Civil Rule of Procedure 20. In evaluating Rule 20, joinder is certainly appropriate for some plaintiffs, as similar issues of law are raised, judicial and party resources are best served by joint filings. However, in balancing the considerations of Rule 20, including the need for accurate accounting by the Court, the sixteen filings here must be further broken down to ensure the parties all have a fair opportunity to logically identify claims and

¹ *Abdullah v. Ford Motor Company*, N25C-03-277 DJB, Docket Item (hereinafter “D.I.” 18, p. 2, *see* D.I. 1, ¶ 1. All docket item references are to the *Abdulla v. Ford Motor Company*, N25C-03-277 docket, unless otherwise specified, given the omnibus nature of the Motion to Sever.

² D.I. 18.

available defenses. A more logical grouping is needed, which requires that many more than sixteen Complaints be filed. Therefore, the omnibus Motion to Sever is GRANTED, in part, and DENIED, in part.

I. FACTS

As stated, sixteen (16) separate product liability Complaints were filed in this matter against Ford, on behalf of sixty-three (63) to ninety-one (91) Plaintiffs per Complaint. The claims arise from approximately 1,358 separate purchases of Ford vehicles, including Ford Fusion and Ford Escape models, equipped with the same 6F35 transmission. The filed Complaints are largely grouped by the state in which the underlying purchases occurred, however not entirely.³ The vehicles were purchased at different times, from different dealerships and locations, and Plaintiffs allege varying defects and problems associated with the 6F35 transmission, mostly in the alternative.⁴

Plaintiffs bring forth claims of breach of express and implied warranties, consumer protection violations, as well as various fraud claims pursuant to the respective laws of the State in which they purchased their Ford vehicle.⁵ Each Complaint contains substantially uniform allegations concerning each Plaintiff's purchase or lease and the alleged defects. Although the Complaints employ

³ D.I. 18 at 5.

⁴ *Id.* at 4.

⁵ *Id.* at 8.

substantially uniform language, they do identify different representations and sources of information, albeit in the alternative, upon which they allegedly relied when making their respective vehicle purchases. Each Complaint contains a uniform paragraph which sets forth the alleged basis for the respective Plaintiff's reliance, which reads:

[Plaintiff had] reviewed and relied on one or more of the following sources touting [previously discussed] features: (a) advertisements and information on Fords' website; (b) online advertisements by Ford; (c) radio and/or televisions [*sic*] advertisements by Ford; (d) sale brochures and marketing literature prepared by Ford; (e) print advertisements by Ford; (f) news articles and/or consumer reviews of the subject vehicle; and (g) representations from Ford's authorized dealer(s).⁶

Each Plaintiff alleges damages from either a purchased or leased Ford Fusion or Escape vehicle, model years 2016 through 2021, for personal, family, or household purposes, due to a defective 6F35 transmission. Further, each Plaintiff avers that, had they known of the alleged defects, they would not have purchased or leased the vehicles.⁷ Each vehicle is averred to have been manufactured and distributed by Ford and accompanied by an express warranty, "by which Ford undertook to preserve or maintain the utility or performance of the Vehicles or provide compensation in case of failure in such utility or performance."⁸ Further, it

⁶ *Id.* at 5, *See e.g. Almond* Compl., N25C-03-271 DJB, ¶ 5. This exact paragraph is found in each of the sixteen Complaints filed.

⁷ D.I. 1, ¶¶ 1, 95-96, 98, 105.

⁸ *Id.*, ¶¶ 96, 100.

is averred the vehicles were backed by a “New Vehicle Limited Warranty,” which covered transmission defects “to all purchasers, lessees and subsequent purchasers and lessees of Fusions and Escapes throughout the United States.”⁹

All Plaintiffs allege they reasonably relied upon Ford’s warranty protections, both express and implied, when deciding to purchase their respective Ford vehicles.¹⁰ Plaintiffs claim Ford breached the applicable warranty by delivering vehicles with defective transmissions, which either fall within the covered warranty period, or such period is extended by the discovery rule.¹¹ Each Plaintiff maintains their Ford vehicles were sold and delivered with defective transmissions, equipped with defects in design, materials used, and/or workmanship and manufacturing and that Ford knew of the existing defective conditions.¹²

Plaintiffs’ Complaints allege transmission defects in the vehicles stemming from either defective transmission software and/or hardware incompatibility malfunctions.¹³ Plaintiffs maintain the alleged vehicle transmission defects, including those causing software impairments, may manifest differently depending on the manner and specific conditions under which the vehicle is operated and that “the problem with the 6F35 transmission is not isolated to a single hardware

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ *Id.*, ¶ 96.

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *Id.*, ¶ 97.

¹³ D.I. 18, p. 6, *See Vandervelde Compl.*, ¶¶ 112-47.

component or single aspect of the software operation.”¹⁴ Plaintiffs commonly allege the concerned vehicles exhibited delayed acceleration, harsh deceleration when slowing, shuddering, shaking, or a loud clunking sound when a transmission gear ratio is selected, and failure to accelerate.¹⁵ Plaintiffs specifically allege that the existing defects manifested in the following ways:

(a) Sudden and unexpected shaking, (b) violent jerking, (c) bucking and kicking on acceleration (commonly referred to as “shuddering” or “juddering”, (d) delayed acceleration (especially from a complete stop), (e) gears slapping, (f) hesitation on acceleration, (g) difficulty stopping the vehicle, (h) lack or loss of motive power, (i) delayed downshifts, (j) hard decelerations or ‘clunks’ when slowing down or accelerating at low speeds, (k) premature wear of the internal components, (l) transmission failures in the middle of roadways creating an unreasonably dangerous situation that increases the risk of an accident, (m) catastrophic failures necessitating replacement, (n) shift flares, (o) clunking and other objectionable noises, and/or (p) lurching, surging, or revving.¹⁶

Plaintiffs concede that they cannot identify a specific defect within the transmissions themselves and instead posit several potential causes including that there may be unsupported software and hardware across the vehicle’s models that “can lead to a transmission that is fundamentally defective.”¹⁷ Plaintiffs specifically identify several potential causes of the software defects which may be the result of either command-and-control software code that was improperly designed and

¹⁴ *Id.*, See *Vandervelde* Compl., ¶¶ 117-18, 131-34, 140.

¹⁵ D.I. 1, ¶ 107.

¹⁶ *Id.*, ¶ 97.

¹⁷ D.I. 18, p.7, See *Vandervelde* Compl., ¶ 136.

executed, insufficient computer chips, deficient calibration values, or divergent learning algorithms as well as several possible explanations for the alleged hardware defects which may be the result of deficient solenoids that actuate at incorrect times, friction and groove plates that don't clamp together properly, defective automatic transmission fluid, or undersized oil pumps.¹⁸ As a result, all Plaintiffs aver they have suffered loss of money, property, and value of their vehicles,¹⁹ and seek a variety of relief including consequential damages, actual, punitive, and statutory damages under any applicable state-specific fraud or consumer protection violations alleged.²⁰

All 1,358 Plaintiffs in the present action previously asserted essentially the same claims in the Eastern District of Michigan Court under a single case caption entitled: *Jones v. Ford Motor Co.*, No. 24-10721.²¹ That civil action was ultimately dismissed upon Ford's filing of a Motion to Sever. In *Jones*, the Eastern District of Michigan severed, and ultimately dismissed, all 1,358 Plaintiffs from the action on grounds of misjoinder, as well as other considerations guided by the unique facts presented during the procedural history of the case.²²

¹⁸ *Id.* at 6, *See Vandervelde Compl.*, ¶¶ 122, 130.

¹⁹ *Id.*, ¶ 99.

²⁰ D.I. 1, p. 343.

²¹ *Jones v. Ford Motor Co.*, 2024 WL 4719702 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 8, 2024).

²² *Id.*

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

All sixteen Complaints were filed on March 21, 2025.²³ A status conference was held by the Court with counsel for all parties on June 20, 2025.²⁴ At that conference, discussion was had regarding filing of the pending motion and the previous litigation in the Eastern District of Michigan.²⁵ A briefing schedule was set on July 1, 2025.²⁶ Ford filed this instant Omnibus Motion to Sever on August 5, 2025.²⁷ Plaintiffs filed their Answering Brief on September 16, 2025.²⁸ Oral argument was heard on the pending Motions to Sever on February 6, 2026.²⁹ At argument the Court informed counsel that there were two pending decisions in similar cases that may impact the Court's decision in this case, that would be passed along once decided.³⁰ On March 26, 2026, the first case, *Bean, et. al. v. JUUL Labs, Inc.*, was decided.³¹ Counsel was afforded until May 15, 2026, to review the Court's decision and amend their respective motions.³²

²³ D.I. 1.

²⁴ D.I. 17.

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ D.I. 15, 16.

²⁷ D.I. 18.

²⁸ D.I. 21.

²⁹ D.I. 25.

³⁰ D.I. 29.

³¹ 2026 WL 839831 (Del. Super. Ct. March 26, 2026).

³² *Id.*

On May 15, 2026, both Parties filed supplemental cross submissions.³³ On May 29, 2026, both Parties filed Responses to the opposing parties' supplemental brief.³⁴ The second case referenced by the Court did not result in a decision given a change in the procedural posture, therefore this case is now ripe for decision.

III. STANDARD OF REVIEW

Under Delaware Superior Court Civil Rule 20(a) plaintiffs may join parties to an action if two requirements are satisfied: (1) “the right to relief asserted must arise out of the same transaction[, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences,] and (2) “there must exist some question of law or fact common to all the parties that will arise in the action.”³⁵ This rule is broadly construed and does not require “precise congruence of all factual and legal issues” as a single common question of law or fact is sufficient to satisfy this requirement.³⁶ The rule serves to promote judicial efficiency by facilitating convenient trials, “expediting the final disposition of disputes” and avoiding duplicative litigation.³⁷ Thus, Parties that are marginally related “are permitted to join when joinder promotes judicial economy.”³⁸

³³ D.I. 30 and 31.

³⁴ D.I. 32 and 33.

³⁵ *Crawford v. Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC*, 2024 WL 2831554, at *4 (Del. Super. May 31, 2024).

³⁶ *Id.*

³⁷ *Id.*

³⁸ *Id.*

IV. ANALYSIS

Ford’s overall argument rests on the assertion that “Plaintiffs cannot establish that they are properly joined or that their joinder otherwise furthers the aims of Rule 20.”³⁹ Ford argues that Plaintiffs should be severed for three reasons. First, Ford claims that Plaintiffs are misjoined, as each filed Complaint does not raise claims that arose from the same series of occurrences, nor do they raise common legal claims. Alternatively, Ford asserts that fairness and efficiency favor severance and the Court should reject joinder as Plaintiffs are improperly attempting to avoid filing costs. Ford urges the Court to apply the reasoning set forth in *Jones v. Ford*, where the Eastern District of Michigan severed the initial products liability suit.⁴⁰

A. Ford’s Prior Conduct Should Not Be Used By this Court in Making a Rule 20(a) Determination.

As an initial matter in its opposition, Plaintiffs argue “Ford’s prior conduct demonstrates that the instant motion is not about allegedly misjoined claims but is instead a blatant attempt to deprive these Plaintiffs of their day in court.”⁴¹ The argument describes Ford’s conduct in prior lawsuits in support.⁴² The requirements set forth under Superior Court Rule 20(a) do not take a party’s prior conduct into account; the Court is simply to analyze joinder under the scope of the rule.

³⁹ D.I. 18, p. 12.

⁴⁰ *Id.*, (citing *Jones*, 2024 WL 4719702).

⁴¹ D.I. 21, p. 2.

⁴² *Id.*

Therefore, Ford's Motion to Sever will be reviewed under the clear direction set forth under Rule 20, absent any considerations to Ford's alleged prior conduct.

B. The *Jones* Decision is Distinguishable.

Ford maintains the federal court's decision in *Jones v. Ford* should guide this Court's decision to grant Ford's Motion to sever Plaintiffs claims, dismiss all but the lead Plaintiff in each filing, and direct the remaining Plaintiffs to proceed individually, if they choose.⁴³ In response, Plaintiffs contend the *Jones* decision is distinguishable because the problematic complaint in *Jones* was a single complaint that included 4,000 individual plaintiffs, from fifty (50) different states, and involved vehicles that spanned over thirteen (13) model years.⁴⁴ Plaintiffs are correct; *Jones* is not controlling.

Unlike in *Jones*, here the Plaintiffs in the sixteen (16) instant complaints encompass "claims on behalf of fewer than 92 plaintiffs each[,] . . . the vast majority of claims (some 98%) involve only 2016-2020 model year vehicles[,] [a]nd here, fifteen (15) of the sixteen (16) complaints include the claims of plaintiffs from only two to six states."⁴⁵ Per current counsel, prior to filing the instant matters, efforts were made to: "reduc[e] the number of plaintiffs . . . from 4[,]000 to 1[,]358;" "expand[] the lawsuits from a single complaint to sixteen;" "reduc[e] the number of

⁴³ *Id.* at 12.

⁴⁴ D.I. 21, pp. 25-26.

⁴⁵ *Id.* at 26.

plaintiff's per complaint from 4[,]000 to an average of 85 plaintiffs per complaint; "group[] plaintiff's by state; and practically eliminat[ed] claims [which arose] from older model year vehicles such that 98% of the claims herein involve only model year 2016-2020 vehicles."⁴⁶

Jones is distinguishable from the case at bar insofar as the Eastern District of Michigan identified several deficiencies in that complaint that are not present here. First, the *Jones* Court rejected its plaintiffs' attempt to plead by spreadsheet and explained that no pleading rule permits such practice.⁴⁷ The initial complaint filed in Michigan captioned one plaintiff, yet attached a spreadsheet that identified over 4,000 individual plaintiffs, without referencing those individual plaintiffs in the complaint itself or with plaintiff-specific factual allegations in separate paragraphs as required by the applicable pleading rules.⁴⁸ Upon direction to re-file, the parties once again captioned only a single plaintiff, yet simply embedded the aforementioned spreadsheet in the content of the complaint.⁴⁹

The *Jones* Court first rejected the joined complaint on the ground that a party who is "not named in the caption of the complaint is not a party to the action."⁵⁰

⁴⁶ *Id.*

⁴⁷ *Jones*, 2024 WL 4719702, at *5-*6.

⁴⁸ *Id.* at *5.

⁴⁹ *Id.*

⁵⁰ *Id.* at *6 (citing *Burrell v. DOCCS*, 655 F.Supp.2d 112, 125 (N.D. N.Y. 2023) (internal citations omitted)).

However, its analysis did not end there. The Court further reasoned that even had the thousands of other individuals been properly identified, severance is still warranted.⁵¹ Finding the claims misjoined, *Jones* held the complaint failed to contain any “factual allegations that [were] specific to” any of the plaintiffs and that the claims “[were] not sufficiently related to constitute the same transaction or occurrence.”⁵² Ultimately, the *Jones* court held that fundamental fairness considerations, as well as the impracticability of joining so many plaintiffs in one “mass action,” all weighed in favor of severance.⁵³

This case is materially distinguishable. Unlike in *Jones*, Plaintiffs here did not plead their claims through spreadsheet. Rather their claims have been divided amongst sixteen (16) separate complaints, with an average of approximately eighty-five (85) Plaintiffs per complaint, for the totaled one thousand, three hundred and fifty-eight (1,358) Plaintiffs as compared to the four thousand (4,000) plaintiffs joined in a single complaint in *Jones*. Moreover, Plaintiffs here are grouped by state and allege “fundamental design failure with respect to the software, hardware, and how they work together”⁵⁴ in vehicles spanning only six model years, whereas the alleged failures in *Jones* spanned thirteen model years.⁵⁵

⁵¹ *Id.* at *7.

⁵² *Id.*

⁵³ *Id.*

⁵⁴ D.I. 21, p. 27, *Andrews Complaint*, ¶¶ 129.

⁵⁵ *Id.* at 25-26.

C. Plaintiffs assert claims that share a common question of law and fact that satisfies the requirements under Rule 20(a).

Ford first argues Plaintiffs' claims do not arise out of the same transaction or occurrence and fail to present common questions of law or fact. In support, Ford maintains Plaintiffs fail to demonstrate a common nucleus of operative fact to support joinder and instead allege that their vehicles have exhibited various symptoms that are caused by fifteen (15) different root causes.⁵⁶ In response, Plaintiffs contend that their claims all arise out of the same transaction and plead commons issues of law and fact such as: "whether the 6F35 transmissions were defective in design;" "when and how Ford learned of the defective transmissions;" "whether the defective transmission caused the problems experienced by Plaintiffs;" "whether Ford breached an express warranty by failing to remedy the defects;" "whether the defects rendered the vehicles unfit for their ordinary use in violation of the implied warranty of merchantability;" "whether Ford owed a duty of disclosure to the Plaintiffs;" "whether Ford breached such a duty;" "whether Ford intentionally concealed the defect;" "whether Ford made misleading statements about the vehicles;" and "whether Ford violated state consumer protection statutes."⁵⁷

In *Crawford v. Syngenta Crop Protection*, this Court declined to sever plaintiffs joined in a toxic tort suit alleging similar injuries, concluding that plaintiffs

⁵⁶ D.I. 18, p. 16.

⁵⁷ D.I. 21, p. 24.

had “satisfied Delaware’s liberal rules for joinder” and “[s]everance would be inefficient, duplicative, and expensive.”⁵⁸ In *Crawford*, the plaintiff’s tort claims stemmed from toxic exposure to chemicals through either skin contact or ingestion.⁵⁹ In declining to sever, the Court reasoned the necessary requirements for joinder were satisfied, even though the underlying facts of the plaintiffs’ claims may not have been identical, because they asserted common legal theories and similar factual allegations.⁶⁰ *Crawford* explained joinder is proper where the legal and factual issues do not precisely overlap as long as the “[p]laintiffs’ claims are reasonably related, and severing the cases would be costly and detrimental to efficiency.” *Crawford* further emphasized the broader purpose of joinder, which is “to promote judicial convenience and expedite the disposition of these disputes,” which, its scenario, was met.⁶¹

While presenting a different underlying factual scenario, *Crawford* is instructive. The Plaintiffs here plead sufficiently similar legal claims and facts to satisfy Rule 20. As previously explained, “[e]ven one common question of law or fact between the parties suffices” under Rule 20(a).⁶² Plaintiffs have raised several common issues of fact and law and similar allegations stemming from “fundamental

⁵⁸ *Crawford*, 2024 WL 2831554, at *5.

⁵⁹ *Id.*

⁶⁰ *Id.*

⁶¹ *Id.*

⁶² *Id.* at *4.

design failure with respect to the software, hardware, and how they work together” in their respective Ford vehicles.⁶³ Plaintiffs’ claims are reasonably related, therefore, the first requirement of Rule 20(a) is satisfied.

Although the first requirement is satisfied, this Court’s recent decision in *Bean, et. al. v. JUUL Labs, Inc.* is instructive and guides further analysis.⁶⁴ In *Bean*, 1,005 plaintiffs across twelve separate complaints filed products liability, fraud, warranty and negligence claims against JUUL Labs, Inc. (hereinafter “JUUL”) an e-cigarette company, arising out of injuries sustained from the use of e-cigarettes.⁶⁵ All plaintiffs alleged that they suffered mutual economic as well as physical injuries from the use of the e-cigarette product that was deceptively marketed as a healthier alternative to traditional cigarettes.⁶⁶ JUUL moved to dismiss the plaintiffs’ complaints on several grounds, including misjoinder under Rule 20.⁶⁷ Ultimately, this Court determined that the appropriate remedy for misjoinder under Rule 20 is severance as opposed to dismissal.⁶⁸ The *Bean* Court granted severance with specific parameters, and its analysis and guidance is equally applicable here.

⁶³ D.I. 21, p. 27, *Andrews* Complaint, ¶¶ 129.

⁶⁴ *Bean v. JUUL Labs, Inc.*, 2026 WL 839831, at *1 (Del. Super. Mar. 26, 2026).

⁶⁵ *Id.*

⁶⁶ *Id.*

⁶⁷ *Id.*

⁶⁸ *Id.*

In *Bean*, JUUL argued misjoinder of the parties because approximately 59 and 68 individual plaintiffs, from as many as 27 states were joined across 12 individual complaints.⁶⁹ JUUL further claimed that joinder was improper because the plaintiffs “purchased JUUL products at different times, in different states, based on different advertising, from different sources, and each suffered different injuries.”⁷⁰ In opposition, the *Bean* plaintiffs argued they were properly joined, as all plaintiffs alleged they relied upon the same false advertising to purchase the same product, for the same type of personal use, and subsequently suffered similar harms.⁷¹

The *Bean* Court weighed the practical considerations that must be made when the judiciary is faced to handle a docket containing 90 plaintiffs.⁷² Namely, the Court noted the very real burden that such an extensive number of plaintiffs contained in a single docket creates for the Prothonotary, as it interferes with staff’s ability to manage and track filings with ease.⁷³ Further, the Court analyzed the financial considerations of joining such a vast number of plaintiffs, which includes ensuring that the important purposes of filing fees are met, and not avoided.⁷⁴ As originally filed, the *Bean* plaintiffs avoided more than \$200,000.00 in filing fees by filing only

⁶⁹ *Bean*, 2026 WL 839831, at *12.

⁷⁰ *Id.*

⁷¹ *Id.*

⁷² *Id.*

⁷³ *Id.*

⁷⁴ *Id.*

twelve complaints. That alone frustrates the purpose filing fees is intended to serve, which helps to fund the judicial staff's services to process the cases. Payment of filing fees additionally ensure individual plaintiffs and attorneys "have 'skin in the game' promoting a thorough review of claims before filing complaints."⁷⁵

Ultimately *Bean* determined that joinder with some parameters was appropriate.⁷⁶ Consistent with *Bean*, the plaintiffs here have demonstrated similar patterns whereby they all allege that they relied on Ford's advertising to purchase vehicles manufactured by Ford equipped with the same defective 6F35 transmissions. Thus, an overarching commonality exists amongst all claims in that all plaintiffs purchased Ford vehicles, equipped with identical 6F35 transmissions, which ultimately turned out to be defective. Moreover, all plaintiffs unsuccessfully sought repairs and suffered similar economic losses. However, that does not mean the Complaints may remain as filed.

D. Fairness, efficiency and other considerations favor severance.

Ford correctly argues that fairness and efficiency factors weigh in favor of severance. Ford argues the sheer number of Plaintiffs, their geographic diversity and dispersion, the impracticability of litigating their claims across the sixteen (16)

⁷⁵ *Bean*, 2026 WL 839831, at *12 (citing *In re Zantac (Ranitidine) Prods. Liab. Litig.* 343 F.R.D. 347, 353 (S.D. Fla. 2023)).

⁷⁶ *Bean*, 2026 WL 839831, at *12 (citing *Davis v. Neal*, 2023 WL 5289445, at *10 (D. Del. Aug. 17, 2023)).

separate complaints, as well as the potential for trial and jury confusion resulting from the individualized “mini” trials that would be necessary to resolve the pending claims, all favor severance.⁷⁷ Further, Ford contends the claims should be severed as their joinder may be motivated by the desire to avoid paying more than \$300,000 in court filing fees that would have otherwise been incurred.⁷⁸

Plaintiffs argue that fairness and efficiency considerations actually support joinder of their claims because their claims alleged involve “common auto defects.”⁷⁹ Plaintiff is correct that, when appropriate, joinder promotes judicial efficiency and ensures consistent legal rulings concerning the same common vehicle transmission defects alleged across Plaintiffs’ claims.⁸⁰ Plaintiffs deny an attempt to avoid paying filing fees, and instead argue the Complaints were filed as is to “result in beneficial economies of scale and judicial efficiency by resolving related issues in a single lawsuit” and argue that severance would “unfairly deprive these Plaintiffs of access to the courts.”⁸¹

The purpose of Rule 20(a) is to promote judicial economy and efficiency by facilitating prompt resolution of claims.⁸² Judicial efficiency, fairness, the practical

⁷⁷ D.I. 18, pp. 22-24.

⁷⁸ *Id.* at 26-27.

⁷⁹ D.I. 21, p. 28.

⁸⁰ *Id.*

⁸¹ *Id.* at 30, *see Beaulieu v. Concord Grp. Ins. Co.*, 208 F.R.D. 478, 479 (D.N.H. 2002).

⁸² *Crawford*, 2024 WL 2831554, at *4.

difficulties of requiring all Plaintiffs – spanning several states – to separately plead their claims, and the potential risk of jury and trial confusions, all weigh in favor of some reasonable joinder. If strict severance is granted, all but the lead named Plaintiffs across the sixteen (16) Complaints filed will be permitted to proceed, while the remaining Plaintiffs will be afforded the opportunity to individually refile their claims. Such an outcome can become overly burdensome and at odds with the purpose Rule 20(a) is intended to serve. Strict severance of all would frustrate, rather than further, the purpose of the rules of joinder, which promote judicial fairness, efficiency, and convenience.

E. A Status Conference will convene to determine the parameters of severance.

Consistent with the principles set forth in *Bean*, a middle ground approach will be taken. Instead of dictating at this point how the cases will be broken down and severed, the Court will afford each party to evaluate each Plaintiff's claim and attempt to group accordingly. A status conference will be held at which time all parties will be expected to engage in discussion with the Court as to a reasonable and logical grouping of Plaintiffs. The Court agrees that the sixteen Complaints are too generalized here to remain as filed. While some joinder is appropriate, that joinder must be within reason.

The plaintiffs' claims will be severed and may be refiled. As to the specific parameters of the re-filing, the Court will provide further instruction upon discussion

with counsel at the upcoming status conference. This solution ensures that the interests of all, including those of the parties and the judiciary are adequately considered. The parties will have the opportunity to provide input with respect to the parameters of the severance at the status conference, with the final determination to be made by the Court. Counsel is to prepare accordingly, with logical proposed groupings that take into account the considerations explained in detail throughout this ruling.

V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons Fords Motion to Sever is **GRANTED**, in part, and **DENIED** in part.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Danielle J. Brennan, Judge