1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JANE DOE,	) Case No.: 1:15-cv-01637 - JLT
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER GRANTING OBJECTION TO THE
13	V.	) PRETRIAL ORDER )
14	COUNTY OF KERN, et al.,	) )
15	Defendants.	)
16		
17	As pointed out by Mr. Navejar (Doc. 46), in the pretrial order, in the "Jurisdiction/Venue"	
18	section, the Court erroneously referred to "42 U.S.C. § 1332" and indicated the Court's jurisdiction	
19	was based in diversity Not only is this an error in referencing the diversity statute, which is 28 U.S.C.	
20	§ 1332, but, of course, the Court's jurisdiction is not based upon diversity. Thus, the Court <b>ORDERS</b> :	
21	1. Mr. Navejar's objection to	o the pretrial order is <b>GRANTED</b> ;
22	2. The pretrial order (Doc. 4	3 at I, line 21) is amended to read, "This court has subject
23	matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C § 1331."	
24		
25	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
26	Dated: May 3, 2017	/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
27		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
28		