

1 WO
2
3
4
5

6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**
8

9 David Kaufman,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 Warner Bros. Entertainment Incorporated,
13 et al.,

14 Defendants.

No. CV-16-02248-PHX-JAT

ORDER

15 “Inquiring whether the court has jurisdiction is a federal judge’s first duty in every
16 case.” *Belleville Catering Co. v. Champaign Market Place, L.L.C.*, 350 F.3d 691, 693
17 (7th Cir. 2003). Further, the Court must assess its subject matter jurisdiction at the time
18 the complaint filed. *See Grupo Dataflux v. Atlas Global Group, L.P.*, 541 U.S. 567, 570-
19 71 (2004).

20 Here, the original complaint (Doc. 1) fails to sufficiently plead jurisdiction.
21 Specifically, it fails to allege a principal place of business for any of the six Defendant
22 corporations. *See Hertz Corp. v. Friend*, 559 U.S. 77, 80, 92-93 (2010) (discussing the
23 citizenship of a corporation).

24 Accordingly,

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IT IS ORDERED that by February 23, 2017, Plaintiff shall file a supplement to the original complaint properly alleging diversity jurisdiction at the time the case was filed, or this case will be dismissed for lack of federal subject matter jurisdiction.

Dated this 16th day of February, 2017.

