

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JS-6

CIVIL MINUTES -- GENERAL

Case No. **CV 17-1275-JFW (MRWx)**

Date: March 1, 2017

Title: Michelle Dermer-Chavez -v- Jun Group Productions, LLC, et al.

PRESENT:

HONORABLE JOHN F. WALTER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**Shannon Reilly
Courtroom Deputy**

**None Present
Court Reporter**

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PLAINTIFFS:

None

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR DEFENDANTS:

None

PROCEEDINGS (IN CHAMBERS):

**ORDER REMANDING ACTION TO LOS ANGELES
SUPERIOR COURT**

On January 3, 2017, Plaintiff Michelle Dermer-Chavez ("Plaintiff") filed a Complaint against Defendant Jun Group Productions, LLC ("Defendant") in Los Angeles Superior Court. On February 16, 2017, Defendant filed a Notice of Removal, alleging that this Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a).

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction, having subject matter jurisdiction only over matters authorized by the Constitution and Congress. See *Bender v. Williamsport Area School District*, 475 U.S. 534, 541 (1986). "Because of the Congressional purpose to restrict the jurisdiction of the federal courts on removal, the statute is strictly construed, and federal jurisdiction must be rejected if there is any doubt as to the right of removal in the first instance." *Duncan v. Stuetzle*, 76 F.3d 1480, 1485 (9th Cir. 1996) (citations and quotations omitted). There is a strong presumption that the Court is without jurisdiction unless the contrary affirmatively appears. See *Fifty Associates v. Prudential Insurance Company of America*, 446 F.2d 1187, 1190 (9th Cir. 1990). As the party invoking federal jurisdiction, Defendant bears the burden of demonstrating that removal is proper. See, e.g., *Gaus v. Miles*, 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992); *Emrich v. Touche Ross & Co.*, 846 F.2d 1190, 1195 (9th Cir. 1988).

Diversity jurisdiction founded under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) requires that (1) all plaintiffs be of different citizenship than all defendants, and (2) the amount in controversy exceed \$75,000. See 28 U.S.C. § 1332. For the purposes of diversity jurisdiction, a limited liability company is a citizen of every state of which its members are citizens. See, e.g., *Johnson v. Columbia Properties Anchorage, LP*, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006) ("[L]ike a partnership, an LLC is a citizen of every state of which its owners/members are citizens."). "Absent unusual circumstances, a party seeking to invoke diversity jurisdiction should be able to allege affirmatively the actual citizenship of the relevant parties." *Kanter v. Warner-Lambert Co.*, 265 F.3d 853, 857 (9th Cir. 2001). To sufficiently

allege the citizenship of unincorporated business entities, “a party must list citizenships of all the members of the limited liability company.” *Rolling Greens MHP, L.P. v. Comcast SCH Holdings L.L.C.*, 374 F.3d 1020, 1022 (11th Cir. 2004).

In the Notice of Removal, Defendant, which is a limited liability company, lists all of its members. However, one of its members, JGP Holdings, LLC (“JGP”), is itself a limited liability company. Defendant fails to list the members of JGP, and, instead, simply alleges in conclusory fashion that JGP “is a citizen of the state of Delaware.” Notice of Removal, ¶ 13. A defendant is presumed to know the facts surrounding its own citizenship. *See, e.g., Dugdale v. Nationwide Mut. Fire Ins. Co.*, 2006 WL 335628, at *5 (E.D. Va. Feb. 14, 2006) (“[A]lthough . . . a defendant need not investigate a plaintiff’s citizenship, certainly a defendant is responsible for knowing its own citizenship, and could not ignore such only to later claim that subsequent documents revealed to the defendant its own citizenship.”); *Day v. Zimmer, Inc.*, 636 F. Supp. 451, 453 (N.D.N.Y. 1986) (holding that, even if a plaintiff misidentifies a defendant’s address, “obviously defendant is in the best position to know its residence for diversity purposes”). As a result, Defendant’s conclusory allegations concerning its own citizenship are insufficient to demonstrate that complete diversity exists.

Accordingly, this action is **REMANDED** to Los Angeles Superior Court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c).

IT IS SO ORDERED.