

1 WO
2
3
4
5

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

9 Steven K Young,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 Annanias & Sapphira Investors Group, et
13 al.,

14 Defendants.

No. CV-16-04545-PHX-JAT

ORDER

15 Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. As a result, they can hear only
16 those cases that the Constitution and Congress have authorized them to adjudicate:
17 namely, cases involving diversity of citizenship, a federal question, or cases to which the
18 United States is a party. *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, 511 U.S. 375, 377
19 (1994). The party asserting jurisdiction bears the burden of proving a jurisdictional basis
20 exists. *Id.* In this case, because Plaintiff filed his suit in federal district court, he must
21 show that the federal court is authorized to hear the case.

22 In the complaint, Plaintiff claims jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal
23 question jurisdiction). Doc. 1 at 4. However, none of Plaintiff's three causes of action
24 (slander of title, quiet title, or declaratory relief) presents a federal question.

25 Plaintiff also alleges jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. § 1332 (diversity
26 jurisdiction). *Id.* However, Plaintiff fails to sufficiently plead diversity jurisdiction.
27 Specifically, Plaintiff fails to allege a principal place of business for either corporate
28 Defendant. *See Hertz Corp. v. Friend*, 559 U.S. 77, 80, 92-93 (2010) (discussing the

1 citizenship of a corporation).

2 Based on the foregoing,

3 **IT IS ORDERED** that by January 25, 2017, Plaintiff shall file a supplement to the
4 complaint properly alleging federal subject matter jurisdiction or this case will be
5 dismissed, without prejudice, for lack of jurisdiction.

6 Dated this 3rd day of January, 2017.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

