


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

DORSET VILLAGE PARTNERS, LP,)
Plaintiff,)
v.)
KESHA WILLIAMS,)
Defendant.)

No. CV 15-2867 PSG (FFMx)
ORDER SUMMARILY REMANDING
ACTION TO STATE COURT

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

On April 17, 2015, Defendant Kesha Williams, having been sued in what appears to be a routine unlawful detainer action in California state court (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 15R00692), filed 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 *in forma pauperis* application under separate cover because the Court lacks jurisdiction over the action. To prevent the action from remaining in jurisdictional limbo, the Court issues this Order to remand the action to state court.

Simply stated, as the Court has previously determined, 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

1 therefore removal is improper. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a); *see Exxon Mobil Corp v. Allapattah*
2 *Svcs., Inc.*, 545 U.S. 546, 563, 125 S. Ct. 2611, 162 L. Ed. 2d 502 (2005). Even if
3 complete diversity of citizenship existed, the amount in controversy does not exceed the
4 diversity-jurisdiction threshold of \$75,000. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441(b). On the
5 contrary, the unlawful-detainer complaint recites that the amount in controversy does not
6 exceed \$10,000.

7 Nor does Plaintiff's unlawful detainer action raise any federal legal question. *See*
8 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441(b).

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

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15
16 DATED: 4/22/15



PHILIP S. GUTIERREZ
United States District Judge

17
18
19 Presented by:

20
21 /S/ FREDERICK F. MUMM
22 FREDERICK F. MUMM
23 United States Magistrate Judge
24
25
26
27
28