

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALEX GULDBECK and KIMBERLY A ANDERSON, No C 09-5733 VRW

Plaintiffs,

ORDER

v

CHASE HOME FINANCE, LLC; FIRST AMERICAN LOANSTAR TRUSTEE SERVICES, MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION SYSTEMS INC; VORHEES VENTURES INC and DOES 1-100,

Defendants.

_____ /

Defendants removed the above-captioned case from San Mateo County superior court on December 7, 2009, asserting the court had jurisdiction pursuant to 28 USC § 1331. Doc #1. Defendants then moved to dismiss the complaint, and the court granted the motion with leave to amend. Doc #27. Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint on March 22, 2010. Doc #31. The amended complaint contains no federal claims, and the parties do not appear to be diverse. While the court had jurisdiction over the case when it was removed, the federal jurisdictional hook was eliminated when

1 plaintiffs failed to assert any federal claims in the amended
2 complaint.

3 The court may, in its discretion, remand a matter if all
4 federal claims have been dismissed. 28 USC § 1367(c)(3); see also
5 Wren v Sletten Construction Co, 654 F2d 529, 536 (9th Cir 1981)
6 ("When the state issues apparently predominate and all federal
7 claims are dismissed before trial, the proper exercise of
8 discretion requires dismissal of the state claims."). The parties
9 are therefore ORDERED to SHOW CAUSE in writing not later than April
10 9, 2010 why the matter should not be remanded to San Mateo County
11 superior court.

12
13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14
15 

16 _____
17 VAUGHN R WALKER
18 United States District Chief Judge