

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
27
28

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

PRIME HEALTHCARE SERVICES-
SHASTA, LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company doing business
as Shasta Regional Medical
Center,

Plaintiff,

v.

BLUE CROSS-BLUE SHIELD OF
ALABAMA, an Alabama corporation;
and DOES 1 through 100,
Inclusive,

Defendant.

)
) 2:11-cv-02644-GEB-CKD
)
)
)
)

)
) RELATED CASE ORDER; AND ORDER
) REMANDING CASES
)
)

PRIME HEALTHCARE SERVICES-
SHASTA, LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company doing business
as Shasta Regional Medical
Center,

Plaintiff,

v.

REGENCE BLUE CROSS CLUE SHIELD
OF OREGON, an Oregon
Corporation, and DOES 1 through
100, Inclusive,

Defendant.

)
) 2:11-cv-02665-JAM-CMK
)
)
)
)

PRIME HEALTHCARE SERVICES-
SHASTA, LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company doing business
as Shasta Regional Medical
Center,

Plaintiff,

v.

)
) 2:11-cv-02666-MCE-CMK
)
)
)
)

1)
2 BCBST, INC., a Tennessee)
3 Corporation; and DOES 1 through)
4 100, Inclusive,)
5 Defendant.)
6)
7 PRIME HEALTHCARE SERVICES-)
8 SHASTA, LLC, a Delaware limited)
9 liability company doing business)
10 as Shasta Regional Medical)
11 Center,)
12 Plaintiff,)
13 v.)
14)
15 HIGHMARK BLUE CROSS CLUE SHIELD)
16 OF PENNSYLVANIA, a Pennsylvania)
17 Corporation; and DOES 1 through)
18 100, Inclusive,)
19 Defendant.)
20)
21 PRIME HEALTHCARE SERVICES-)
22 SHASTA, LLC, a Delaware limited)
23 liability company doing business)
24 as Shasta Regional Medical)
25 Center,)
26 Plaintiff,)
27 v.)
28)
HEALTH CARE SERVICE CORPORATION,)
a Mutual Legal Reserve Company,)
doing business as Blue Cross)
Blue Shield of Illinois, Blue)
Cross Blue Shield of Texas, Blue)

2:11-cv-02667-JAM-CMK

2:11-cv-02668-MCE-CMK

2:11-cv-02669-MCE-CMK

1 Cross Blue Shield of New Mexico,)
2 Blue Cross Blue Shield of)
3 Oklahoma; and DOES 1 through)
4 100, Inclusive,)
5 Defendant.)

6 PRIME HEALTHCARE SERVICES-)
7 SHASTA, LLC, a Delaware limited)
8 liability company doing business)
9 as Shasta Regional Medical)
10 Center,)

11 Plaintiff,)

12 v.)

13 BCBSM, INC., a Minnesota)
14 Corporation; and DOES 1 through)
15 100, Inclusive,)

16 Defendant.)

17 PRIME HEALTHCARE SERVICES-)
18 SHASTA, LLC, a Delaware limited)
19 liability company doing business)
20 as Shasta Regional Medical)
21 Center,)

22 Plaintiff,)

23 v.)

24 BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF NORTH)
25 CAROLINA, a North Carolina)
26 Corporation, and DOES 1 through)
27 100, Inclusive,)

28 Defendant.)

2:11-cv-02670-JAM-CMK

2:11-cv-02691-GEB-CMK

23 A "Notice of Related Cases" document has been filed in which
24 it is asserted that the above-captioned actions concern "the same or
25 substantially related . . . or similar questions of law and fact[.]"

26 The above-captioned actions are related within the meaning of
27 Local Rule 123. Under the regular practice of this Court, related cases
28

1 are generally assigned to the judge and magistrate judge to whom the
2 first filed case was assigned.

3 Therefore, actions 2:11-cv-02665-JAM-CMK, 2:11-cv-02666-MCE-
4 CMK, 2:11-cv-02667-JAM-CMK, 2:11-cv-02668-MCE-CMK, 2:11-cv-02669-MCE-
5 CMK, and 2:11-cv-02670-JAM-CMK are reassigned to Judge Garland E.
6 Burrell, Jr., and to Magistrate Judge Carolyn K. Delaney. Further, 2:11-
7 cv-02691-GEB-CMK is reassigned to Magistrate Judge Delaney. Henceforth
8 the caption on any document filed in the reassigned actions shall
9 include the following initials: "GEB-CKD."

10 The Clerk of the Court shall make appropriate adjustment in
11 the assignment of civil cases to compensate for these reassignments.

12 Further, the Court sua sponte considers whether subject matter
13 removal jurisdiction exists. Each case was removed from state court on
14 the basis of diversity removal jurisdiction, which has not been shown to
15 exist.


16 "There is a strong presumption against removal jurisdiction,
17 and the removing party has the burden of establishing that removal is
18 proper." Lindley Contours, LLC v. AABB Fitness Holdings, Inc., 2011 WL
19 398861, at *1 (9th Cir. Feb. 8, 2011) (internal quotation marks
20 omitted). Although the basis of removal of each case is asserted to be
21 diversity jurisdiction, the removant has not sufficiently alleged the
22 citizenship of all owners/members of Plaintiff Prime Healthcare
23 Services-Shasta, LLC. "For purposes of diversity jurisdiction, . . . a
24 limited liability corporation is a citizen of all of the states of which
25 its owners/members are citizens. . . . [;and,] the citizenship of all
26 members of limited liability corporations . . . [must] be alleged." Id.

27 Since the removant has failed to show diversity of citizenship
28 removal jurisdiction, each case is remanded to the California Superior

1 Court in the County of Shasta, from which it was removed, as required by
2 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c) for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under 28
3 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1).

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: November 22, 2011

6
7 
8 _____
9 GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
10 United States District Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28