
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 2:23-cv-10729-JLS-AS Date: February 05, 2024

Title: Angela Nails v. Uber

Present: **Honorable JOSEPHINE L. STATON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

Gabby Garcia
Deputy Clerk

N/A
Court Reporter

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PLAINTIFF: ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR DEFENDANT:

Not Present

Not Present

**PROCEEDINGS: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER DISMISSING ACTION FOR LACK
OF SUBJECT-MATTER JURISDICTION**

Plaintiff Angela Nails *pro se* filed a complaint against Defendant Uber. (Compl., Doc. 1.) Plaintiff does not specify what claims she asserts; nor does she specify what basis this Court has for jurisdiction. (*See id.*) However, Plaintiff’s complaint alleges that Uber’s conduct violated “***State*** employment Rules.” (*Id.* at 2. (emphasis added).) Accordingly, the Court interprets Plaintiff to assert state-law claims and invoke this Court’s diversity jurisdiction.

“Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction.” *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994). As the party invoking federal jurisdiction, Plaintiff has the burden of establishing that this case is within the Court’s jurisdiction. *See id.* A federal court has diversity jurisdiction if (1) the parties to the action are citizens of different states, and (2) the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). In determining the citizenship of a corporation, “a corporation shall be deemed to be a citizen of every State . . . by which it has been incorporated and of the State . . . where it has its principal place of business.” *Id.* § 1332(c)(1).

Here, Plaintiff makes no factual allegations about her citizenship or the citizenship of Defendant, and the Court cannot determine that it has jurisdiction over this action. Accordingly, the Court DISMISSES this action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction WITHOUT PREJUDICE to its refiling in a court of competent jurisdiction.

Initials of Preparer: gga