1	
2	
3	O O
4	
5	JS - 6
6	55-0
7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE) Case No. EDCV 14-01220 DDP (SHx) ASSOCIATION,)
12) Plaintiff,) ORDER REMANDING CASE FOR LACK OF
13	v.
14	SHAWNNA BROWN,
15	Defendant.
16)
17	
18	Plaintiff filed an unlawful detainer complaint against
19	Defendant in state court on February 11, 2014. (Dkt. No. 1)
20	Defendant removed the action to this court on June 13, 2014 on the

Defendant in state court on February 11, 2014. (Dkt. No. 1)
Defendant removed the action to this court on June 13, 2014 on the
basis of federal question jurisdiction. (<u>Id.</u>) It appears, however,
that there is no federal subject matter jurisdiction in this
action. Plaintiff's unlawful detainer complaint raises only issues
of state law, and the amount in controversy does not exceed
\$75,000.

District courts have original jurisdiction over "all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Though Defendant asserts various 1 federal defenes, "[u]nder the longstanding well-pleaded complaint 2 rule, . . . a suit `arises under' federal law only when the plaintiff's statement of his own cause of action shows that it is 3 based upon federal law." Vaden v. Discover Bank, 556 U.S. 49, 60 4 (2009) (quotation, citation, and alteration omitted). "Federal 5 6 law" cannot be predicated on a defense or counterclaim. Id. 7 Defenses based on federal law are, therefore, insufficient to create federal jurisdiction. See HSBC Bank USA v. Santiago, No. CV 8 9 10-04127, 2011 WL 165382, at *1-2 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 18, 2011).

10 This court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff's11 complaint, and remands this case to state court.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 24, 2014

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

26

27

28

AmpRegerson

DEAN D. PREGERSON United States District Judge