1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION, 11 No. 2:12-cv-2649 KJM DAD PS Plaintiff, 12 VS. 13 SUZANNE BESAG, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 14 15 Defendant. 16 17 By Notice of Removal filed October 25, 2012, this unlawful detainer action was 18 removed from the Solano County Superior Court by defendant Suzanne Besag, who has 19 requested leave to proceed in forma pauperis and who is proceeding pro se. Accordingly, the 20 matter has been referred to the undersigned for all purposes encompassed by Local Rule 21 302(c)(21). 22 It is well established that the statutes governing removal jurisdiction must be 23 "strictly construed against removal." Libhart v. Santa Monica Dairy Co., 592 F.2d 1062, 1064 (9th Cir. 1979) (citing Shamrock Oil & Gas Corp. v. Sheets, 313 U.S. 100, 108 (1941)). See also 24 Syngenta Crop Prot., Inc. v. Henson, 537 U.S. 28, 32 (2002); Provincial Gov't of Martinduque v. 25 Placer Dome, Inc., 582 F.3d 1083, 1087 (9th Cir. 2009). "Federal jurisdiction must be rejected if 26

there is any doubt as to the right of removal in the first instance." Gaus v. Miles, Inc., 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992). "The burden of establishing federal jurisdiction falls on the party invoking removal." Harris v. Provident Life & Accident Ins. Co., 26 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 1994) (quoting Gould v. Mut. Life Ins. Co., 790 F.2d 769, 771 (9th Cir.1986)). See also Provincial Gov't of Martinduque, 582 F.3d at 1087. Moreover, "the existence of federal jurisdiction depends solely on the plaintiff's claims for relief and not on anticipated defenses to those claims." ARCO Envtl. Remediation, LLC v. Dep't of Health & Envtl. Quality, 213 F.3d 1108, 1113 (9th Cir. 2000). Where it appears, as it does here, that the district court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over a removed case, "the case shall be remanded." 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c).

In removing this action, defendant alleges in conclusory fashion that "this court has original jurisdiction under the provisions of United States Code Title 28, Section 1441(b)." (Notice of Removal (Doc. No. 1) at 2.) It is evident however from a reading of plaintiff's complaint that this is nothing more than a garden-variety unlawful detainer action filed against the former owner of real property located in California and that it is based wholly on California law. As such, the complaint does not involve any "claim or right arising under the Constitution, treaties or laws of the United States" that would have permitted plaintiff to file this action originally in federal court. See 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b). Thus, defendant has failed to meet her burden of establishing a basis for federal jurisdiction over this action.

Accordingly, IT IS RECOMMENDED that this action be summarily remanded to the Solano County Superior Court and that this case be closed.

These findings and recommendations will be submitted to the United States

District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within

fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file

written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. A document presenting

objections should be titled "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations."

Any reply to objections shall be filed and served within seven days after service of the objections.

| 1 | The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the |
|----|---|
| 2 | right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). |
| 3 | DATED: November 6, 2012. |
| 4 | 2 2 . |
| 5 | Dale A. Dage DALE A. DROZD |
| 6 | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | DAD:6 |
| 11 | Ddad1\orders.pro se\FNMA-besag2649.f&r.remand.ud |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |