

Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED** that by July 30, 2010, the removing Defendant shall file an amended notice of removal properly alleging federal subject matter jurisdiction, or this case will be remanded for lack of federal subject matter jurisdiction.<sup>1</sup>

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant is cautioned that it will be given one opportunity to amend to cure the jurisdiction defects. The Court will not issue additional sua sponte show cause orders to assist Defendant in pleading jurisdiction.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, if the amended notice of removal fails to plead federal subject matter jurisdiction, this case will be remanded without the Court sua sponte granting Defendant any further opportunities to amend.

DATED this 16<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2010.

James A. Teilborg / United States District Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The amended notice of removal must contain all jurisdictional allegations sufficient to plead jurisdiction in one document and should not anticipate that the Court will read any previous filings to assess jurisdiction. *See Harris v. Bankers Life and Casualty Co.*, 425 F.3d 689, 695-96 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005); *Valdez v. Allstate*, 372 F.3d 1115, 1117 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The Court should not give a party advice because giving advice would undermine a district judge's role as an impartial decision maker. *See Pliler v. Ford*, 542 U.S. 225, 231 (2004).