2 3 3 4 4 5 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 0 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 11 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 11 13 LAURELHURST DRIVE FEE OWNER 14 Plaintiffs, 15 V. 16 V. 17 Defendant.
4
5 6 6 7 7 8 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 11 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 International States States 13 LAURELHURST DRIVE FEE OWNER LLC, et al., 14 Plaintiffs, 15 V. 16 V. 17 Defendant.
6 7 7 7 8 7 9 7 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 11 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 7 13 LAURELHURST DRIVE FEE OWNER LLC, et al., 14 Plaintiffs, 15 v. 16 v. 17 ORDER REMANDING CASE
7 8 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 11 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 Image: Comparison of the comparison of t
 8 9 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 11 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 13 LAURELHURST DRIVE FEE OWNER LLC, et al., 14 Plaintiffs, 15 v. 16 v. 17 Defendant.
9 IUNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 11 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 IONO 2:17-cv-01096-TLN-CKD 13 LAURELHURST DRIVE FEE OWNER LLC, et al., 14 Plaintiffs, 15 V. 16 V. 17 Defendant.
10UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT11FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA12International Struct of California13LAURELHURST DRIVE FEE OWNER LLC, et al.,14No. 2:17-cv-01096-TLN-CKD15Plaintiffs,16V.16V.17Defendant.
11FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA121314141516V.16VICKI GRAM,17Defendant.
 12 13 LAURELHURST DRIVE FEE OWNER LLC, et al., 14 Plaintiffs, 15 v. 16 v. 16 VICKI GRAM, 17 Defendant.
 13 LAURELHURST DRIVE FEE OWNER LLC, et al., 14 Plaintiffs, 15 v. 16 v. 17 VICKI GRAM, 17 Defendant.
14 Interference of Defendant. 14 Plaintiffs, 15 v. 16 VICKI GRAM, 17 Defendant.
 Plaintiffs, V. V. VICKI GRAM, Defendant.
 15 v. 16 v. VICKI GRAM, 17 Defendant.
16 VICKI GRAM, 17 Defendant.
17 Defendant.
19 This matter is before the Court pursuant to Defendant Vicki Gram's ("Defendant") Notice
20 of Removal and motion to proceed in forma pauperis. (ECF Nos. 1–2.) For the reasons set forth
21 below, Defendant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis is GRANTED. The Court hereby
22 REMANDS the action to the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento, due to lack of
23 subject matter jurisdiction.
24 I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY
25 On April 25, 2017, Plaintiffs Laurelhurst Drive Fee Owner LLC and Laurelhurst Drive
26 Fee Owner II LLC ("Plaintiffs") filed an unlawful detainer action in the Superior Court of
27 California, County of Sacramento. (Not. of Removal, ECF No. 1 at 1.) On May 25, 2017,
28 Defendant filed a Notice of Removal in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of
1

California. (ECF No. 1.) Defendant asserts that removal is proper because (i) "[t]he complaint
presents federal questions" and (ii) "[f]ederal question exists because Defendant's Answer, a
pleading that depends on the determination of Defendant's rights and Plaintiff's [sic] duties under
federal law." (ECF No. 1 at 2–3, ¶¶ 5, 8.) For the reasons stated below, this Court finds that
subject matter jurisdiction does not exist and thus this case must be remanded.

6

II. STANDARD OF LAW

28 U.S.C. § 1441 permits the removal to federal court of any civil action over which "the
district courts of the United States have original jurisdiction." 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a). Removal is
proper only if the court could have exercised jurisdiction over the action had it originally been
filed in federal court. *Caterpillar, Inc. v. Williams*, 482 U.S. 386, 392 (1987).

Courts "strictly construe the removal statute against removal jurisdiction," and "the defendant always has the burden of establishing that removal is proper." *Gaus v. Miles, Inc.*, 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992) (per curiam). Furthermore, "[i]f the district court at any time determines that it lacks jurisdiction over the removed action, it must remedy the improvident grant of removal by remanding the action to state court." *California ex rel. Lockyer v. Dynegy, Inc.*, 375 F.3d 831, 838, *as amended*, 387 F.3d 966 (9th Cir. 2004), *cert. denied* 544 U.S. 974 (2005).

The "presence or absence of federal-question jurisdiction is governed by the 'well-pleaded complaint rule,' which provides that federal jurisdiction exists only when a federal question is
presented on the face of the plaintiff's properly pleaded complaint." *Caterpillar*, 482 U.S. at 392.
Removal cannot be based on a defense, counterclaim, cross-claim, or third party claim raising a
federal question, whether filed in state court or federal court. *See Vaden v. Discover Bank*, 556
U.S. 49, 60–61 (2009); *Hunter v. Philip Morris USA*, 582 F.3d 1039, 1042–43 (9th Cir. 2009).

24

III. ANALYSIS

Defendant removed the instant action to this Court on the basis of federal question
jurisdiction. (ECF No. 1 at 2–3.) Defendant argues that jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. §
///

28 ///

1	1441(a) or (b). ¹ (ECF No. 1 at 2.) For jurisdiction to exist under § 1441(a), a federal question	
2	must be presented on the face of the plaintiff's properly pleaded complaint. Caterpillar, 482 U.S.	
3	at 392. Here, Defendant states without explanation that the "complaint presents federal	
4	questions." (ECF No. 1 at 2, \P 5.) However, Plaintiffs' complaint for unlawful detainer does not	
5	present a federal question on its face. See, e.g., DVP, LP v. Champ, No. 1:15-cv-00074-LJO-	
6	SKO, 2015 WL 12681672, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 29, 2015) ("[A]n unlawful detainer action, on its	
7	face, fails to raise a federal question."). Defendant further claims that her Answer implicates	
8	federal questions because it requires a "determination of Defendant's rights and Plaintiff's [sic]	
9	duties under federal law." (ECF No. 1 at 2, \P 8.) An answer cannot confer federal question	
10	jurisdiction on this Court. See Vaden, 556 U.S. at 60 (explaining federal jurisdiction can neither	
11	be "predicated on an actual or anticipated defense" nor "rest upon an actual or anticipated	
12	counterclaim").	
13	To the extent Defendant's notice of removal seeks removal on the basis of Section	
14	1441(b), this too fails. Section 1441(b) allows for a case to be removed to federal court on the	
15	basis of diversity jurisdiction if the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) are met. Section 1332(a)	
16	confers diversity jurisdiction "where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of	
17	\$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between $-(1)$ citizens of different States." In an	
18	unlawful detainer action, only the right to possession of the property is at issue, not the title. See	
19	Deutsche Bank Nat'l Trust Co. v. Yanez, ED-15-CV-02462-VAP-DTBx, 2016 WL 591752, at *2	
20	(C.D. Cal. February 11, 2016) (citing Evans v. Superior Court, 67 Cal. App. 3d 162, 170 (1977)).	
21	Consequently, the amount in controversy is determined by the amount sought in the complaint.	
22	See id. Here, Defendant fails to meet the \$75,000 threshold as Plaintiffs seek less than \$10,000 in	
23	their complaint. (See ECF No. 1-1 at 3.)	
24	Thus, Defendant has failed to establish the burden of showing that jurisdiction before this	
25	Court is proper, and it is appropriate to remand this case, sua sponte, for lack of federal	
26		
27	¹ Defendant fails to explain how or why subject matter jurisdiction exists under 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b). In fact,	
28	other than Defendant's passing mention of §1441(b), Defendant fails to discuss diversity jurisdiction. Nonetheless, this Court discusses below why removal is improper under §1441(b).	

1	jurisdiction. See United Investors Life Ins. Co. v. Waddell & Reed Inc., 360 F.3d 960, 967 (9th
2	Cir. 2004) ("[T]he district court ha[s] a duty to establish subject matter jurisdiction over the
3	removed action sua sponte, whether the parties raised the issue or not.").
4	IV. CONCLUSION
5	For the foregoing reasons, the Court hereby REMANDS this action to the Superior Court
6	of California, County of Sacramento. In removing this case, Defendant filed a motion to proceed
7	in forma pauperis. (See ECF No. 2.) The Court has reviewed this motion and finds that
8	Defendant meets the requirements of in forma pauperis status and thus GRANTS Defendant's
9	request.
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.
11	
12	Dated: May 26, 2017
13	my Hunday
14	Troy L. Nunley
15	United States District Judge
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	4