

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SEQUOIA EQUITIES, L.P.,
Plaintiff,
v.
MICHELE A. DAEDONE,
Defendant.

No. 2:17-cv-00795-KJM-EFB

ORDER

The issue in this case is unlawful detainer, with an amount in controversy of less than \$3,000. *See* ECF No. 1. On April 17, 2017, defendant Michele A. Daedone removed this case from state court to federal court. *Id.* Additionally, defendant filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP). ECF No. 2.

When a case “of which the district courts of the United States have original jurisdiction” is initially brought in state court, a defendant may remove it to federal court. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a). There are two bases for federal subject matter jurisdiction: (1) federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and (2) diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. A federal district court may remand a case *sua sponte* where a defendant has not established federal jurisdiction. *See Enrich v. Touche Ross & Co.*, 846 F.2d 1190, 1195 (9th Cir. 1988) (citing *Wilson v. Republic Iron & Steel Co.*, 257 U.S. 92, 97 (1921)). “If at any time

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 the Sacramento County
4 Superior Court. Because the amount in controversy is less than \$75,000, and the main issue turns
5 on state law, removal is improper because this court does not have subject matter jurisdiction
6 under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1441.

7 I. CONCLUSION

8 This case is remanded to Sacramento County Superior Court. Defendant’s IFP
9 motion is DENIED as MOOT.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 DATED: April 20, 2017

12
13 
14 _____
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28