JS-6

FILED
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
6/4/2015
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY: CW DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LA AINA, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

MANUEL DANTIC, MARIGINA DANTIC and DOES 1-10, Inclusive,

Defendants.

No. CV 15-3959 MWF (FFMx)

ORDER SUMMARILY REMANDING ACTION TO STATE COURT

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

On March 3, 2015, Defendant Manuel Dantic, having been sued in what appears to be a routine unlawful detainer action in California state court (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 15P01624), 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

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 L. Ed. 2d 502 (2005). Even if complete diversity of citizenship existed, 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, Pasadena Courthouse, 300 East Walnut Street, Pasadena, California 91101 for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c); (2) that the Clerk send a certified copy of this Order to the state court; and (3) that the Clerk serve copies of this Order on the parties.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: June 4, 2015

MICHAEL W. FITZGERALD
United States District Judge

Presented by:

/S/ FREDERICK F. MUMM
FREDERICK F. MUMM
United States Magistrate Judge