

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

**United States District Court
Central District of California**

CENTREPOINTE DISTRIBUTION
CENTER II, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.
AUTOPARTSMAN CORPORATION;
KIMSA INTERNATIONAL
CORPORATION; PARTS WORLD
CORPORATION; KYUNG TAEK KIM;
SOON TAEK KIM; DANNY KIM;
JONATHAN KIM; CESAR JOSUE
CAICEDO; DOES 1–40, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:14-cv-02553-ODW(AJWx)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE.
LACK OF SUBJECT-MATTER
JURISDICTION**

On April 3, 2014, Plaintiff Centrepointe Distribution Center II, LLC filed suit against Defendants, ostensibly invoking diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. (ECF No. 1.) After reviewing the Complaint, the Court notes that Centrepointe has inadequately alleged its own jurisdiction. The Court therefore needs further clarification from Centrepointe in order to proceed.

1 Centerpointe is a limited-liability company formed under Delaware law.
2 (Compl. ¶ 3.) Plaintiffs goes on to allege that it has its principal place of business in
3 Seattle, Washington. (*Id.*) But that is not the test for citizenship of a limited-liability
4 company. Rather, a limited-liability company “is a citizen of every state of which its
5 owners/members are citizens.” *Johnson v. Columbia Props. Anchorage, LP*, 437 F.3d
6 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006). Centrepointe has not identified its members—let alone
7 pleaded their citizenship.

8 The Court therefore **ORDERS** Centrepointe to **SHOW CAUSE** in writing by
9 **Monday, April 14, 2014**, why the Court should not dismiss its action for lack of
10 subject-matter jurisdiction. No hearing will be held. The Court will discharge this
11 Order upon receipt of a declaration establishing the citizenship of Centrepointe’s
12 members. Failure to timely respond will result in dismissal for lack of prosecution
13 and jurisdiction.

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15
16 April 7, 2014

17
18 

19 **OTIS D. WRIGHT, II**
20 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**