

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. **CV 20-9315-DMG (PDx)** Date **October 15, 2020**

Title ***Krystal Ventures, LLC v. Gentry Beach*** Page **1 of 1**

Present: The Honorable **DOLLY M. GEE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

KANE TIEN

Deputy Clerk

NOT REPORTED

Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff(s)
None Present

Attorneys Present for Defendant(s)
None Present

**Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS—ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THIS ACTION
SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER
JURISDICTION**

On October 9, 2020, Plaintiff Krystal Ventures, LLC filed a Complaint against Defendant Gentry Beach asserting claims for breach of contract, fraud, and unjust enrichment. [Doc. # 1.]

Plaintiff asserts subject matter jurisdiction based on the existence of complete diversity, 28 U.S.C. § 1332, but the Complaint fails to adequately plead “complete diversity between the parties,” namely, that Defendant is a citizen of a different state than Plaintiff. *Diaz v. Davis*, 549 F.3d 1223, 1234 (9th Cir. 2008) (citing *Strawbridge v. Curtiss*, 7 U.S. (3 Cranch) 267, 267, 2 L. Ed. 435 (1806)); see Compl. at ¶ 6. Plaintiff is a limited liability company and is therefore a citizen of every state in which its owners or members are citizens. See *Johnson v. Columbia Props. Advantage, LP*, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006). The Complaint fails to plead the citizenship of any of Plaintiff’s owners or members.

In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff is **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** in writing by no later than **October 22, 2020** why this action should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.