

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

-----oo0oo-----

COMCAST OF SACRAMENTO I, LLC;
COMCAST OF SACRAMENTO II,
LLC; and COMCAST OF
SACRAMENTO III, LLC;

 Plaintiffs,

 v.

SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN CABLE
TELEVISION COMMISSION, and
DOES 1 through 20,

 Defendant.

CIV. NO. 2:16-1264 WBS EFB
ORDER

-----oo0oo-----


 After reviewing the parties' Joint Status Report, the court is uncertain as to whether it has jurisdiction in this matter. Defendant is a California municipal entity. (Joint Status Report at 5 (Docket No. 16).) Plaintiffs, California limited liability companies, claim that they are not citizens of California, but citizens of Pennsylvania and Michigan. (Compl.

1 ¶¶ 1-3, 8 (Docket No. 1).) The Ninth Circuit has held that "an
2 LLC is a citizen of every state of which its owners/members are
3 citizens." Johnson v. Columbia Properties Anchorage, LP, 437
4 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006). Plaintiffs have not provided any
5 indication that their owners and members are not citizens of
6 California. Given plaintiffs' names and registrations, the court
7 cannot make that assumption. Accordingly, the basis for
8 diversity jurisdiction is unclear.

9 Accordingly, on or before January 30, 2017, counsel for
10 plaintiffs shall file a statement setting forth whether any of
11 plaintiffs' owners or members are citizens of California for
12 purposes of diversity jurisdiction.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: January 24, 2017

15 
16 WILLIAM B. SHUBB
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28