

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

JS-6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

QUINCY PRICE,)	Case No. CV 15-4591-ODW (PJWx)
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER SUMMARILY REMANDING IMPROPERLY
)	REMOVED ACTION TO SUPERIOR COURT
v.)	
)	
ERIKA MCGEE,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
)	

Before the Court is an unlawful detainer action that Defendant Erika McGee removed from the Los Angeles County Superior Court. For the following reasons, the case is summarily remanded back to that court.

In March 2015, Plaintiff Quincy Price filed an unlawful detainer action against Defendant Erika McGee in the Los Angeles County Superior Court, claiming that Defendant owed him \$3,100 in past-due rent. On June 17, 2015, Defendant removed the action to this court, arguing that there was federal question jurisdiction because the resolution of her answer turned on questions on federal law.

Generally speaking, federal district courts lack subject matter jurisdiction over unlawful detainer actions like this one because they

1 are grounded in state, not federal, law and do not become federal
2 cases when a defendant raises a federal question as an affirmative
3 defense or counterclaim. See *Vaden v. Discover Bank*, 556 U.S. 49, 60
4 (2009) ("Federal jurisdiction cannot be predicated on an actual or
5 anticipated defense. . .[or] rest upon an actual or anticipated
6 counterclaim.") (internal citations omitted). Further, it is clear
7 from the face of the Complaint that there is no diversity jurisdiction
8 under 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because, even if Defendant could establish
9 diversity, the amount in controversy is less than \$10,000. As a
10 result, Defendant's removal of the action was improper and the case
11 will be remanded to the Superior Court for further proceedings. See
12 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a); see also *Gaus v. Miles, Inc.*, 980 F.2d 564, 567
13 (9th Cir. 1992).

14 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that (1) pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
15 § 1447(c), this case is REMANDED to the Superior Court of California,
16 110 North Grand Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90012; (2) the clerk shall send
17 a certified copy of this Order to the state court; and (3) the clerk
18 shall serve copies of the Order on the parties.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 DATED: June 24, 2015 _____



OTIS D. WRIGHT, II
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

21 Presented by:

22
23
24 

25 PATRICK J. WALSH
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

27
28 C:\Users\senglish\Desktop\E McGee.wpd