Ш

| 1 | |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 8 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 9 | |
| 10 | THOMAS STEVENS DUMAS, |
| 11 | NO. CIV. S-10-1523 LKK/DAD Plaintiff, |
| 12 | v. |
| 13 | <u>ORDER</u> FIRST NORTHERN BANK, dba |
| 14 | FIRST NORTHERN, et al., |
| 15 | Defendants. |
| 16 | / |
| 17 | This case was originally filed by plaintiff in Placer County |
| 18 | Superior Court. The original complaint alleged both state and |
| 19 | federal claims arising from a loan transaction and subsequent |
| 20 | initiation of foreclosure proceedings on plaintiff's property. |
| 21 | Defendants removed the case to this court on the basis of |
| 22 | federal question jurisdiction only. |
| 23 | Plaintiff filed an amended complaint on October 20, 2010, |
| 24 | alleging both state and federal claims. ECF No. 23. Defendants |
| 25 | Paramount, Chase, and MERS filed motions to dismiss the amended |
| 26 | complaint, which this court granted in part and denied in part. The |
| | 1 |

court granted plaintiff leave to amend the complaint, and plaintiff
filed a Second Amended Complaint.

The Second Amended Complaint does not allege any violations of federal law. No party has asserted any other basis for federal court jurisdiction over this case. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c), district courts shall remand a removed case "[i]f at any time before final judgment it appears that the district court lacks subject matter jurisdiction."

9 Accordingly, the parties are ORDERED to show cause in writing 10 within seven (7) days of the issuance of this order why this case 11 should not be remanded to state court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

DATED: February 17, 2012.

SENIOR JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2