1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN D	DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10			
11	NAJIBULLA AMIN,	2:23-cv-01085-TLN-KJN (PS)	
12	Plaintiff,	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF SUBJECT	
13	v.	MATTER JURISDICTION; ORDER	
14	AMANULLAH ZAMANI.,		
15	Defendant.		
16			
17	Plaintiff, proceeding without counsel in this action, requests leave to proceed in forma		
18	pauperis ("IFP"). <sup>1</sup> (ECF No. 2.) See 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (authorizing the commencement of an		
19	action "without prepayment of fees or security" by a person who is unable to pay such fees).		
20	However, because the undersigned finds that the court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over this		
21	action, the undersigned recommends that the action be dismissed without prejudice, and that		
22	plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis in this court be denied as moot. See United		
23	Investors Life Ins. Co. v. Waddell & Reed Inc., 360 F.3d 960, 967 (9th Cir. 2004) (noting the		
24	federal court's independent duty to ensure it ha	as subject matter jurisdiction in the case).	
25	////		
26	<sup>1</sup> Actions where a party proceeds without cours	sel are referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to	
27	<sup>1</sup> Actions where a party proceeds without counsel are referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to E.D. Cal. L.R. 302(c)(21). See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72. Resolution of		
28	dispositive matters by a magistrate judge are to be filed as findings and recommendations. <u>See</u> Local Rule 304.		
		1	

## <u>Legal Standards</u>

1

2	Pro se pleadings are to be liberally construed. <u>Hebbe v. Pliler</u> , 627 F.3d 338, 342 & fn.7	
3	(9th Cir. 2010) (liberal construction appropriate even post-Iqbal). Prior to dismissal, the court is	
4	to tell the plaintiff of deficiencies in the complaint and provide an opportunity to cure—if it	
5	appears at all possible the defects can be corrected. See Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130-31	
6	(9th Cir. 2000) (en banc). However, if amendment would be futile, no leave to amend need be	
7	given. Cahill v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co., 80 F.3d 336, 339 (9th Cir. 1996). The court must dismiss a	
8	case if, at any time, it determines that it lacks subject matter jurisdiction. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).	
9	A federal district court generally has jurisdiction over a civil action when: (1) a federal question	
10	is presented in an action "arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States" or	
11	(2) there is complete diversity of citizenship and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. See	
12	28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332(a). Further, a plaintiff must have standing to assert a claim, which	
13	requires an injury in fact caused by defendant(s) that may be redressed in court. Harrison v.	
14	Kernan, 971 F.3d 1069, 1073 (9th Cir. 2020).	
15	Federal courts lack subject matter jurisdiction to consider claims that are "so	
16	insubstantial, implausible, foreclosed by prior decisions of this court, or otherwise completely	
17	devoid of merit as not to involve a federal controversy." Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better	
18	Environment, 523 U.S. 83, 89 (1998); see also Grancare, LLC v. Thrower by & through Mills,	
19	889 F.3d 543, 549-50 (9th Cir. 2018) (noting that the "wholly insubstantial and frivolous"	
20	standard for dismissing claims operates under Rule 12(b)(1) for lack of federal question	
21	jurisdiction). A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.	
22	Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). A court may dismiss a claim as frivolous where	
23	it is based on an indisputably meritless legal theory or where the factual contentions are clearly	
24	baseless. <u>Id.</u> at 327; Rule 12(h)(3).	
25	////	
26	////	
27	////	
• •		

28 ////

1	Analysis	
2	Plaintiff alleges defendant is liable for \$19,886.95 incurred while plaintiff was working	
3	for defendant's trucking company, Silk Z Road Transportation LLC. (ECF No. 1 at 9.) Plaintiff	
4	is a citizen of California and defendant is a citizen of Texas. (Id.) While the parties appear to be	
5	diverse, the amount in controversy alleged in the complaint does not exceed \$75,000. Further,	
6	plaintiff does not assert any federal claims against defendant. Therefore, the undersigned finds	
7	plaintiff has not alleged any claims over which this court has subject matter jurisdiction. See 28	
8	U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332(a) (federal courts have subject matter jurisdiction over a civil action	
9	provided: (1) a federal question is presented in an action "arising under the Constitution, laws, or	
10	treaties of the United States" or (2) there is complete diversity of citizenship and the amount in	
11	controversy exceeds \$75,000.) Accordingly, the court recommends that the action be dismissed	
12	without prejudice for lack of federal subject matter jurisdiction. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3) (the	
13	court must dismiss a case if, at any time, it determines that it lacks subject matter jurisdiction).	
14	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	
15	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:	
16	1. Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2) be DENIED AS MOOT;	
17	2. The action be DISMISSED for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; and	
18	3. The Clerk of Court be directed to CLOSE this case.	
19	These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to	
20	the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen (14) days after	
21	being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with	
22	the court. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and	
23	Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time	
24	may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. <u>Turner v. Duncan</u> , 158 F.3d 449, 455	
25	(9th Cir. 1998); Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153, 1156-57 (9th Cir. 1991).	
26	////	
27	////	
28	////	
	3	

1	ORDER	
2	All pleading, discovery, and motion practice in this action are stayed pending resolution of	
3	these findings and recommendations. Other than objections to the findings and recommendations	
4	or non-frivolous motions for emergency relief, the court will not entertain or respond to any	
5	pleadings or motions until the findings and recommendations are resolved.	
6	Dated: November 7, 2023	
0 7		
8	KENDALLINEWMAN	
0 9	amin.1085 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
10		
10		
12		
12		
13		
14		
15		
10		
18		
19		
20		
20		
21		
22		
23 24		
25		
23 26		
20 27		
27		
20	4	