

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.

_____ /

On March 31, 2010, the court ordered the parties to show cause why the action should not be remanded to San Mateo County superior court, as the amended complaint contains no federal claims. Doc #32. The deadline to respond to the court's order has passed, and no party has objected to the proposed remand. See Doc ##33, 36.

Because all federal claims have been dismissed, remand is appropriate. 28 USC § 1367(c)(3); see also Wren v Sletten Construction Co, 654 F2d 529, 536 (9th Cir 1981) ("When the state

1 issues apparently predominate and all federal claims are dismissed
2 before trial, the proper exercise of discretion requires dismissal
3 of the state claims."). Accordingly, the action is hereby REMANDED
4 to San Mateo County superior court. The clerk is directed to
5 terminate all motions and close the file.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 

9
10 _____
11 VAUGHN R WALKER
12 United States District Chief Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28