THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH CENTRAL DIVISION

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	* * * * * * *	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
FILTAGREEN INTERNATIONAL, et al.,)	Case No. 2:16-cv-790- DS
Plaintiffs)	
VS.)	MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER
HARRY DSCHAAK, et al.,)	
Defendants.	,	
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	* * * * * *	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Defendants' Harry Dschaak and Marie Melonakos-Katas each have filed Motions to Dismiss (Doc. #7 & #9 respectively) for lack of jurisdiction.

In the Amended Complaint Plaintiffs assert both federal question and diversity jurisdiction. Plaintiffs now concede that assertion of federal question jurisdiction was in error. See Mem. Opp'n at 5-6. What remains is for the Court to examine Plaintiffs' claim of diversity of citizenship jurisdiction.

District courts have original jurisdiction of all civil actions "where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000 ... and is between ... citizens of different States.." 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1). "Under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) the citizenship of all defendants must be different from the citizenship of all plaintiffs." *McPhail v. Deere & Co.*, 529 F.3d 947, 951 (10th Cir. 2008). For purposes of § 1332, a corporation is deemed to be a "citizen of every State ... by which it has been incorporated and of the State ... where it has its principal place of business" 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1).

Plaintiff Filtagreen International, Inc. is alleged to be incorporated under the laws of

Idaho having its principal place of business in Utah. Am. Compl. at 2. Defendant Harry

Dschaak is alleged to be a citizen of Idaho. Id. at 3. Having its principal place of business

in Utah does not undermine the fact that Filtagreen is incorporated in Idaho and is

considered a citizen of Idaho for purposes of diversity. Because both Plaintiff Filtagreen

and Defendant Dschaak are citizens of Idaho, diversity of citizenship jurisdiction is lacking.

Accordingly, both Motions to Dismiss (Doc. #7 & Doc. #9) are granted and this case

is dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 28th day of September, 2016

BY THE COURT:

DAVID SAM

SENIOR JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT