

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

JS-6

CIVIL MINUTES -- GENERAL

Case No. **CV 17-2189-JFW (JEMx)**

Date: March 23, 2017

Title: HSBC Bank USA, N.A.-v- Srunya Werajitteen Ponvanit, 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 20, 2017, Plaintiff HSBC Bank USA, National Association as Trustee For the Holders of the Ellington Loan Acquisition Trust 2007-2, Mortgage Pass-through Certificates, Series 2007-2, ("Plaintiff") filed a Complaint for Unlawful Detainer against Defendants Srunya Werajitteen Ponvanit, Ignacia Zuniga, Celia Jimenez and Jose D. Avila, in Los Angeles Superior Court. On March 21, 2017, Srunya Werajitteen Ponvanit ("Defendant") filed a Notice of Removal, alleging that this Court has jurisdiction.

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).

Defendant fails to meet her burden of demonstrating that removal is proper. Plaintiff's Complaint alleges one claim for unlawful detainer under state law. While Defendant alleges in her

Initials of Deputy Clerk sr

Notice of Removal that the claim arises under federal law, “[a]n unlawful detainer action does not raise a question arising under federal law and so, once removed, must be remanded for lack of jurisdiction.” *Cooper v. Washington Mut. Bank*, 2003 WL 1563999, *2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 19, 2003) (internal citation omitted). Accordingly, there is no federal question jurisdiction presented by Plaintiff’s action.

For the foregoing reasons, this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over this action. 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.

Initials of Deputy Clerk sr