

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 WEDGEWOOD,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 KAO SAELEE,

15 Defendant.  
16

No. 2:15-cv-0338 JAM CKD PS

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

17 This action was removed from state court. Removal jurisdiction statutes are strictly  
18 construed against removal. See Libhart v. Santa Monica Dairy Co., 592 F.2d 1062, 1064 (9th Cir.  
19 1979). “Federal jurisdiction must be rejected if there is any doubt as to the right of removal in the  
20 first instance.” Gaus v. Miles, 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992). The party invoking removal  
21 bears the burden of establishing federal jurisdiction. Hunter v. Philip Morris USA, 582 F.3d 1039  
22 (9th Cir. 2009). Where it appears the district court lacks subject matter jurisdiction, the case shall  
23 be remanded. 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c).

24 In conclusory fashion, the removal petition alleges the complaint is subject to federal  
25 question jurisdiction. Removal based on federal question jurisdiction is proper only when a  
26 federal question is presented on the face of the plaintiff’s properly pleaded complaint. Caterpillar  
27 Inc. v. Williams, 482 U.S. 386, 392 (1987). However, the exhibits attached to the removal  
28 petition establish the state court action is nothing more than a simple unlawful detainer action,

1 and the state court action is titled as such. Defendants have failed to meet their burden of  
2 establishing federal jurisdiction and the matter should therefore be remanded. See generally  
3 Singer v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., 116 F.3d 373, 375-376 (9th Cir. 1997).

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

6 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge  
7 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days  
8 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 advised  
12 that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District  
13 Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

14 Dated: February 17, 2015

15   
16 CAROLYN K. DELANEY  
17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

18 4 wedgewood.remud  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28