


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



JP fars.B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE)
ASSOCIATION, A/K/A FANNIE)
MAE,)
Plaintiff,)
v.)
ANDRES M. HERNANDEZ, JR.;)
JOSE LUIS HERNANDEZ; AND)
DOES 1 TO 10, INCLUSIVE,)
Defendants.)

No. CV 13-8783 UA (DUTYx)
ORDER SUMMARILY REMANDING
ACTION TO STATE COURT AND
PROHIBITING DEFENDANT FROM
FILING ANY FURTHER NOTICE OF
REMOVAL OF LOS ANGELES
SUPERIOR COURT CASE NO.
13F07052

The Court will remand "Defendant, Jose Hernandez[']s] Notice of Removal of the Above Entitled Case to the United States District Court for the Central District of California," Case No. 13F07052, to state court summarily because Defendant removed it improperly.

On November 27, 2013, Defendant Jose Hernandez, having been sued in what appears to be a routine unlawful detainer action in California state court, lodged a Notice of Removal of that action to this Court and also presented an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Defendant has previously removed this same unlawful detainer proceeding on one prior occasion. On the prior occasion, this Court remanded the action noting that federal jurisdiction does not exist.

///

1 The Court has denied the *in forma pauperis* application under separate cover
2 because the action, again, was not properly removed. To prevent the action from
3 remaining in jurisdictional limbo, the Court issues this Order to remand the action to
4 state court. Moreover, to prevent Defendant from further abusing the federal court to
5 obstruct his state proceedings without any basis, the Court issues this order prohibiting
6 him from filing any further notice of removal with respect to this unlawful detainer
7 action.

8 Simply stated, as the Court has previously determined, Plaintiff could not have
9 brought this action in federal court in the first place, in that Defendant does not
10 competently allege facts supplying either diversity or federal-question jurisdiction, and
11 therefore removal is improper. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a); *see Exxon Mobil Corp v. Allapattah*
12 *Svcs., Inc.*, 545 U.S. 546, 563, 125 S. Ct. 2611, 162 L. Ed. 2d 502 (2005). Even if
13 complete diversity of citizenship existed, the amount in controversy does not exceed the
14 diversity-jurisdiction threshold of \$75,000. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441(b). On the
15 contrary, the unlawful-detainer complaint recites that the amount in controversy does not
16 exceed \$10,000.

17 Nor does Plaintiff's unlawful detainer action raise any federal legal question. *See*
18 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441(b).

19 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that (1) this matter be REMANDED to the
20 Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Long Beach Courthouse, 275
21 Magnolia Avenue, Long Beach, California 90802 for lack of subject matter jurisdiction
22 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c); (2) that the Clerk send a certified copy of this Order to
23 the state court; and (3) that the Clerk serve copies of this Order on the parties.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///


27 ///

28 ///


1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Jose Hernandez is prohibited from filing any
2 further Notice of Removals of this case from state court without an Order of the Court or
3 of the Chief Judge of the Central District of California allowing him to do so.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5
6 DATED: 12/11/13

7
8 
9 _____
10 GEORGE H. KING
11 Chief United States District Judge

11 Presented by:

12 
13 /S/ FREDERICK F. MUMM
14 FREDERICK F. MUMM
15 United States Magistrate Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28