



1 either diversity jurisdiction or federal question jurisdiction. *City of Chicago*, 522 U.S. at 163;  
2 *Caterpillar Inc. v. Williams*, 482 U.S. 386, 392 (1987). Once a case is removed to federal court, a  
3 party challenging the removal may move to remand the case on the basis of a lack of diversity  
4 jurisdiction or federal question jurisdiction. *Kelton Arms Condo. Owners Ass'n, Inc. v.*  
5 *Homestead Ins. Co.*, 346 F.3d 1190, 1192 (9th Cir. 2003); 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c).

6 Federal courts may exercise diversity jurisdiction when the amount in controversy exceeds  
7 \$75,000 and the parties are in complete diversity, i.e. that citizenship of each plaintiff is different  
8 from that of each defendant. *See Hunter v. Philip Morris USA*, 582 F.3d 1039, 1043 (9th Cir.  
9 2009); *Matheson v. Progressive Specialty Ins. Co.*, 319 F.3d 1089, 1090 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also*  
10 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a).

11 Here, plaintiff's opposition to removal is based primarily on his age and health condition.  
12 Thus, plaintiff argues, it will be inconvenient to personally travel to this U.S. District Court.  
13 Because this is an insufficient basis for challenging the removal of this action, the court denies  
14 plaintiff's request. Plaintiff is, however, free to file a properly noticed motion to remand if he so  
15 chooses.

16 Plaintiff is further advised that in this case, telephonic appearances before the undersigned  
17 are encouraged. (*See* Doc. No. 4-1.) Parties may appear at hearings telephonically by contacting  
18 the court at (559) 499-5650 at least forty-eight hours in advance of any scheduled hearing in  
19 order to make the necessary arrangements for electronic appearance.

20  
21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: July 26, 2016

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE