1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	MICHAEL DEAN,	No. 2:16-cv-2776 TLN CKD PS
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER AND
14	STEVE COMBS, et al.,	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff is proceeding in this action pro se. Plaintiff has requested authority pursuant to	
18	28 U.S.C. § 1915 to proceed in forma pauperis. This proceeding was referred to this court by	
19	Local Rule 302(c)(21).	
20	Plaintiff has submitted the affidavit required by § 1915(a) showing that plaintiff is unable	
21	to prepay fees and costs or give security for them. Accordingly, the request to proceed in forma	
22	pauperis will be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).	
23	In the complaint, plaintiff complains about what appears to be a breach of contract dispute	
24	involving landscaping services. The complaint, however, does not allege a basis for subject	
25	matter jurisdiction in this court other than citing "federal question" jurisdiction, without setting a	
26	proper basis therefor. The complaint only cites "\$2,000,000" as the basis for federal question	
27	jurisdiction. The federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. In the absence of a basis for	
28	federal jurisdiction, plaintiff's claims cannot proceed in this venue. Because there is no basis for	

federal subject matter jurisdiction evident in the complaint, and diversity jurisdiction is lacking, plaintiff will be ordered to show cause why this action should not be dismissed. Failure to allege a proper basis for subject matter jurisdiction will result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. Plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2) is granted; 2. No later than December 14, 2016, plaintiff shall show cause why this action should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Dated: December 1, 2016 CAROLYN K. DELANEY UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 4 dean2776.ifp.nosmj