



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Archstone Vista Del Rey,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Jasmond Sutton et al,

Defendants.

CASE NO. CV 13-9472 UA (SH)

ORDER SUMMARILY REMANDING  
IMPROPERLY-REMOVED ACTION

The Court will remand this unlawful detainer action to state court summarily because Defendant removed it improperly.

On December 26, 2013, defendant Jasmond Sutton, 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*. The Court has denied the latter application under separate cover because the action was not properly removed. To prevent the action from remaining in jurisdictional limbo, the Court issues this Order to remand the action to state court.

Simply stated, Plaintiff could not have brought this action in federal court in 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

1 L.Ed.2d 502 (2005). Even if complete diversity of citizenship exists, the amount in  
2 controversy does not exceed the diversity-jurisdiction threshold of \$75,000. *See* 28 U.S.C.  
3 §§ 1332, 1441(b). On the contrary, the unlawful-detainer Complaint recites that the  
4 amount in controversy does not exceed \$10,000.

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

7 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that (1) this matter be REMANDED to the  
8 Superior Court of California, Los Angeles County, West District-Santa Monica  
9 Courthouse, 1725 Main St., Santa Monica, Ca 90401 for lack of subject matter jurisdiction  
10 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c); (2) that the Clerk send a certified copy of this Order to  
11 the state court; and (3) that the Clerk serve copies of this Order on the parties.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 DATED: 1/12/04  
14

15  
16   
17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 GEORGE H. KING  
19 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28