1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	RAJ SINGH, et al.,	No. 2:15-cv-2663 MCE CKD PS
12	Plaintiffs,	
13	v.	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
14	TAMMY FERNANDES, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiffs are proceeding in this action pro se. The complaint names as defendants a	
18	former tenant of plaintiffs and the attorneys who represented the former tenant in a state court	
19	action against plaintiffs. Plaintiffs allege that defendants violated their constitutional rights.	
20	However, defendants do not appear to be state actors and therefore a claim under the Civil Rights	
21	Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, cannot lie.	
22	The federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. In the absence of a basis for federal	
23	jurisdiction, plaintiffs' claims cannot proceed in this venue. Because there is no basis for federal	
24	subject matter jurisdiction evident in the complaint, plaintiffs will be ordered to show cause why	
25	this action should not be dismissed. Failure to allege a proper basis for subject matter jurisdiction	
26	will result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed.	
27	/////	
28	/////	
		1

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that no later than January 25, 2016, plaintiffs shall show cause why this action should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Dated: January 6, 2016 CAROLYN K. DELANEY UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 4 singh2663.osc.nosmj