| v. vvii | 100 1 00d3, LLO Ct di | | |
|---------|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| 1 | SEYFARTH SHAW LLP Alfred L. Sanderson (State Bar No. 186071) | | |
| 2 | Kristina M. Launey (State Bar No. 221335) Jason D. Glenn (State Bar No. 244470) | | |
| 3 | 400 Capitol Mall, Suite 2300 Sacramento, California 95814-4428 | | |
| 4 | Telephone: (916) 448-0159 Facsimile: (916) 558-4839 | | |
| 5 | Attorneys for Defendant | | |
| 6 | WINCÓ FOODS, LLC | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 10 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| 11 | MANDI HOVATER, individually and on behalf) of all similarly situated current and former | Case No. 2-10-CV-00621-JAM-DAD | |
| 12 | employees of WINCO FOODS, LLC, and WINCO FOODS, INC., | ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO REMAND | |
| 13 | Plaintiffs, | Date: June 16, 2010 | |
| 14 | v.) | Time: 9:30 a.m. Judge: Hon. John A. Mendez | |
| 15 | WINCO FOODS, LLC, WINCO FOODS, INC. | Trial Date: None Set | |
| 16 | and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, | Complaint filed: February 18, 2010 | |
| 17 | Defendants. | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | DI : CCM I'II () M (') D | | |
| 20 | Plaintiff Mandi Hovater's Motion to Remand came on for hearing before this Court on | | |
| 21 | June 16, 2010, the Honorable John A. Mendez presiding. Marta Manus appeared on behalf of | | |
| 22 | plaintiff, and Alfred L. Sanderson, Jr. appeared on behalf of defendant WinCo Foods, LLC. The | | |
| 23 | Court, having read and considered all papers filed in conjunction with this motion and having | | |
| 24 | considered the parties' oral argument at the hearing on the motion, orders as follows: | | |
| 25 | Plaintiff's Motion to Remand is hereby DENIED. Plaintiff argued that because only state | | |
| 26 | law claims remain after the filing of a First Amended Complaint, the court has discretion to | | |
| 27 | remand the case. The Court holds that, notwithstanding the filing of plaintiff's First Amended | | |
| 28 | Complaint and the dismissal of former plaintiff Jackson, it retains subject matter jurisdiction 1 | | |
| | [Proposed] Order Denying Pl | aintiff's Motion to Remand | |

| 1 | because it had diversity jurisdiction at the time of defendant's timely removal. See Williams v. | | |
|----------|--|--|--|
| 2 | Costco Wholesale Corp., 471 F.3d 975, 976 (9th Cir. 2006). | | |
| 3 | For these reasons, plaintiff's Motion to Remand is DENIED. | | |
| 4 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | Dated: June 23, 2010 /s/ John A. Mendez Hon. John A. Mendez | | |
| 7 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | | | |
| | [Proposed] Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Remand | | |