1			
2			5
3			201:
4			Z JUL X U.S. TRAL SA
5			FILED 27 AM DISTRICT NTA ANA
6			AH II
7	UNITED STATE	S DISTRICT COURT	AM IO: 07
8	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9			
10	RUSSELL CARR,) CASE NO. CV 12	2-5959-UA (MLG)
11	Plaintiff,	}	
12	vs.		RILY REMANDING EMOVED ACTION
13	SUCCESS CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP, et	}	
14	al.,	}	
15	Defendants.) -	
16		1 6114 '	
17	The Court will remand this unlawful detainer action to state court summarily		
18	because Defendant removed it improperly.		
19	On July 11, 2012, Defendant Romeo Panisa, having been sued in what appears		
20	to be a routine unlawful detainer action in California state court, lodged a Notice Of		
21	Removal of that action to this Court and also presented an application to proceed in forma		
22	pauperis. The Court has denied the latter application under separate cover because the		
23	action was not properly removed. To prevent the action from remaining in jurisdictional		
24	limbo, the Court issues this Order to remand the action to state court.		
25	Simply stated, Plaintiff could not have brought this action in federal court in		
26	the first place, in that Defendants do not competently allege facts supplying either diversity		

or federal-question jurisdiction, and therefore removal is improper. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a);

see Exxon Mobil Corp v. Allapattah Svcs., Inc., 545 U.S. 546, 563, 125 S.Ct. 2611, 162

L.Ed.2d 502 (2005). Even if complete diversity of citizenship exists, the amount in controversy does not exceed the diversity-jurisdiction threshold of \$75,000. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441(b). On the contrary, the unlawful-detainer complaint recites that the amount in controversy does not exceed \$10,000. Nor does Plaintiff's unlawful detainer action raise any federal legal question. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441(b). Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that (1) this matter be REMANDED to the Superior Court of California, Los Angeles County, 415 West Ocean Blvd., Long Beach, CA 90802, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c); (2) that the Clerk send a certified copy of this Order to the state court; and (3) that the Clerk serve copies of this Order on the parties. IT IS SO ORDERED. July 1 9, 2012 DATED: RICT JUDGE