1 2 3 CLERK, U.S DISTRICT COURT 4 **AUG** 1 4 2012 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 11 RUSSELL CARR, CASE NO. CV 12-06606-UA (DUTYx) Plaintiff, 12 ORDER SUMMARILY MANDING IMPROPERLY-13 VS. REMOVED ACTION 14 SUCCESS CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION, 15 et al., 16 Defendant. 17 The Court will remand this unlawful detainer action to state court summarily 18 19 because Defendant removed it improperly. On March 28, 2012, Defendant Jordon Zoller, having been sued in what appears to 20 be a routine unlawful detainer action in California state court, lodged a Notice of Removal 21 of that action to this Court and also presented an application to proceed in forma pauperis. 22 The Court has denied the latter application under separate cover because the action was 23 not properly removed. To prevent the action from remaining in jurisdictional limbo, the 24 Court issues this Order to remand the action to state court. 25 26 Simply stated, Plaintiff could not have brought this action in federal court in the first

place, in that Defendant does not competently allege facts supplying either diversity or

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

27

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, County of Los Angeles, 415 West Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach, CA 90802, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c); (2) the Clerk send a certified copy of this Order to the state court; and (3) the Clerk serve copies of this Order on the parties. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: _ 8/8/2012 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE