based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship be No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COUR' EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORN MARIANNE NEIDIGH, Plaintiff V. ROXANNE LORAINE SLAUGH AND DOES 1 THROUGH 10, INCLUSIVE, Defendants. Presently before the Court is Defendant ROXANNE SL remand the above case to the California Superior Court for th based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship to No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). ///	I I	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COUR EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORN MARIANNE NEIDIGH, Plaintiff V. ROXANNE LORAINE SLAUGH AND DOES 1 THROUGH 10, INCLUSIVE, Defendants. Presently before the Court is Defendant ROXANNE SL remand the above case to the California Superior Court for th based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship to No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). ///		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COUR EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORN MARIANNE NEIDIGH, Plaintiff V. ROXANNE LORAINE SLAUGH AND DOES 1 THROUGH 10, INCLUSIVE, Defendants. Presently before the Court is Defendant ROXANNE SL remand the above case to the California Superior Court for th based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship to No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). ///		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COUR EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORN MARIANNE NEIDIGH, Plaintiff V. ROXANNE LORAINE SLAUGH AND DOES 1 THROUGH 10, INCLUSIVE, Defendants. Presently before the Court is Defendant ROXANNE SL remand the above case to the California Superior Court for th based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship to No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). ///		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COUR' BASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORN MARIANNE NEIDIGH, Plaintiff V. ROXANNE LORAINE SLAUGH AND DOES 1 THROUGH 10, INCLUSIVE, Defendants. Presently before the Court is Defendant ROXANNE SL remand the above case to the California Superior Court for the based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship to No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). IIII		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COUR' EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORN MARIANNE NEIDIGH, Plaintiff V. ROXANNE LORAINE SLAUGH AND DOES 1 THROUGH 10, INCLUSIVE, Defendants. Presently before the Court is Defendant ROXANNE SL remand the above case to the California Superior Court for th based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendan case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship to No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). ///		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COUR' EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORN MARIANNE NEIDIGH, Plaintiff V. ROXANNE LORAINE SLAUGH AND DOES 1 THROUGH 10, INCLUSIVE, Defendants. Presently before the Court is Defendant ROXANNE SL remand the above case to the California Superior Court for th based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship by No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). ///		
BUNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORN MARIANNE NEIDIGH, Plaintiff V. ROXANNE LORAINE SLAUGH AND DOES 1 THROUGH 10, INCLUSIVE, Defendants. Presently before the Court is Defendant ROXANNE SL remand the above case to the California Superior Court for the based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship to No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). ///		
BEASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORN MARIANNE NEIDIGH, Plaintiff V. ROXANNE LORAINE SLAUGH AND DOES 1 THROUGH 10, INCLUSIVE, Defendants. Presently before the Court is Defendant ROXANNE SL remand the above case to the California Superior Court for the based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship to No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). III III		
MARIANNE NEIDIGH, Plaintiff V. ROXANNE LORAINE SLAUGH AND DOES 1 THROUGH 10, INCLUSIVE, Defendants. Presently before the Court is Defendant ROXANNE SL remand the above case to the California Superior Court for th based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship to No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). MARIANNE NEIDIGH, No. 2:16-cv-016	Г	
MARIANNE NEIDIGH, Plaintiff V. ROXANNE LORAINE SLAUGH AND DOES 1 THROUGH 10, INCLUSIVE, Defendants. Presently before the Court is Defendant ROXANNE SL remand the above case to the California Superior Court for th based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship by No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule").	IA	
MARIANNE NEIDIGH, Plaintiff V. ROXANNE LORAINE SLAUGH AND DOES 1 THROUGH 10, INCLUSIVE, Defendants. Presently before the Court is Defendant ROXANNE SL remand the above case to the California Superior Court for th based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship by No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule").	CA MOE COLL	
No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule").	54-MCE-GGH	
ROXANNE LORAINE SLAUGH AND DOES 1 THROUGH 10, INCLUSIVE, Defendants. Presently before the Court is Defendant ROXANNE SL remand the above case to the California Superior Court for th based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship by No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule").		
Defendants. Presently before the Court is Defendant ROXANNE SL remand the above case to the California Superior Court for the based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship by No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule").		
Presently before the Court is Defendant ROXANNE SL remand the above case to the California Superior Court for th based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship b No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule").		
Presently before the Court is Defendant ROXANNE SL remand the above case to the California Superior Court for the based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship to No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). ///		
remand the above case to the California Superior Court for the based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship to No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). ///		
based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship by No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). ///	AUGH's timely motion to	
case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship by No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). ///	remand the above case to the California Superior Court for the County of El Dorado,	
No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, how is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). ///	based on a defect in her initial removal procedure. Defendant originally removed the	
is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). ///	case under 28 USC § 1332 based on diversity of citizenship between the parties (ECF	
commonly known as the "forum defendant rule"). ///	No. 1). As Defendant explains in her unopposed motion, however, because Defendant	
24 ///	is a citizen of California, such removal was improper under 28 USC § 1441(b)(2) (more	
25 ///		
26 ///		
27 ///		
28 /// Order 1		

	I
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7
2	8

Good cause having been shown, the Court hereby GRANTS Defendant's motion (ECF No. 4). The Clerk of the Court is directed to remand this case to the originating state court, the Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado, for final adjudication and to close this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 1, 2016

MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Order