1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 SOUTHSIDE BROOKSHORE No. 2:17-cv-00488-KJM-DB ASSOCIATES, LP, 12 Plaintiff, 13 **ORDER** v. 14 PHILIP LEE HENRY, 15 Defendant. 16 17 The issue in this case is unlawful detainer, with an amount in controversy of less 18 19 than \$2,000. See ECF No. 1. On March 7, 2017, defendant Philip Lee Henry removed this case 20 from state court to federal court. *Id.* Additionally, defendant filed a motion to proceed in forma 21 pauperis. ECF No. 2. 22 When a case "of which the district courts of the United States have original 23 jurisdiction" is initially brought in state court, a defendant may remove it to federal court. 24 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a). There are two bases for federal subject matter jurisdiction: (1) federal 25 question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and (2) diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. 26 § 1332. A federal district court may remand a case sua sponte where a defendant has not 27 established federal jurisdiction. See Enrich v. Touche Ross & Co., 846 F.2d 1190, 1195 (9th Cir. 28 1988) (citing Wilson v. Republic Iron & Steel Co., 257 U.S. 92, 97 (1921)). "If at any time 1

1	before final judgment it appears that the district court lacks subject matter jurisdiction, the case
2	shall be remanded." 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c).
3	Here, the court finds the case should be remanded to San Joaquin County Superior
4	Court. Because the amount in controversy is less than \$75,000, and the main issue turns on state
5	law, removal is improper because this court does not have subject matter jurisdiction under 28
6	U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1441.
7	I. <u>CONCLUSION</u>
8	This case is remanded to San Joaquin County Superior Court. Defendant's IFP
9	motion is DENIED as MOOT.
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.
11	DATED: March 10, 2017
12	(\circ)
13	Mulle
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	