

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST  
COMPANY,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-10-1739 GEB KJM PS

vs.

REYNALDO AMODO,

Defendant.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Defendant removed this action from state court. Removal jurisdiction statutes are strictly construed against removal. See Libhart v. Santa Monica Dairy Co., 592 F.2d 1062, 1064 (9th Cir. 1979). “Federal jurisdiction must be rejected if there is any doubt as to the right of removal in the first instance.” Gaus v. Miles, 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992). “The burden of establishing federal jurisdiction falls on the party invoking removal.” Harris v. Provident Life and Accident Ins. Co., 26 F.3d 930 (9th Cir. 1994) (quoting Gould v. Mut. Life Ins. Co. of New York, 790 F.2d 769, 771 (9th Cir. 1986)). Where it appears the district court lacks subject matter jurisdiction, the case shall be remanded. 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c).

In conclusory fashion in the removal petition, defendant alleges plaintiff is subject to various federal statutes but does not allege a proper basis for removal. It appears the state court action is nothing more than a simple unlawful detainer action. Defendant has failed to

1 meet his burden of establishing federal jurisdiction and the matter should therefore be remanded.  
2 See generally Singer v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., 116 F.3d 373, 375-76 (9th  
3 Cir. 1997).

4           Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that the above-entitled action  
5 be summarily remanded to the Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin.

6           These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District  
7 Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen  
8 days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written  
9 objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned  
10 “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Any reply to the objections  
11 shall be served and filed within seven days after service of the objections. The parties are  
12 advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the  
13 District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

14 DATED: July 23, 2010.

15   
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

16 006  
17 deutsche-amodo.rem