

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

JS-6

CIVIL MINUTES -- GENERAL

Case No. **CV 18-5239-JFW(Ex)**

Date: July 10, 2018

Title: Paul Vazquez, et al. al -v- Rexam, Inc., 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 November 28, 2016, Plaintiffs Paul Vazquez and Martha Vazquez (collectively, "Plaintiffs") filed a Complaint against Defendant Rexam Beverage Can Company (erroneously sued and named as Rexam, Inc., d/b/a Rexam Beverage Can Company). On June 13, 2018, Defendant filed a Notice of Removal of Action to Federal Court ("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(a). Defendant contends that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000 and alleges in conclusory fashion that "the Complaint itself is sufficient evidence to establish that it is more likely than not that the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional amount of \$75,000." Notice of Removal, ¶ 2. However, the Complaint is devoid of any facts from which the Court can determine that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. Where, as in this case, it is unclear

from the face of the complaint whether the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, “the removing defendant bears the burden of establishing, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional threshold.” *Urbino v. Orkin Servs. of Cal., Inc.*, 726 F.3d 1118, 1121–22 (9th Cir. 2013) (quotation marks and citations omitted). The amount in controversy may include “damages (compensatory, punitive, or otherwise) and the cost of complying with an injunction, as well as attorneys' fees awarded under fee shifting statutes.” *Gonzales v. CarMax Auto Superstores, LLC*, 840 F.3d 644, 648–49 (9th Cir. 2016). However, “[c]onclusory allegations as to the amount in controversy are insufficient.” *Corral v. Select Portfolio Servicing, Inc.*, 878 F.3d 770, 774 (9th Cir. 2017). Therefore, Defendant’s conclusory allegation regarding the amount in controversy is insufficient.

For all the foregoing reasons, 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.