

No. 14 (report and recommendation). Judge Beeler also recommended that Ms. Lopez's motion to

proceed in forma pauperis be denied as moot. Finally, in her report, Judge Beeler noted that

24 objections to the report had to be filed within fourteen days after the party was served with a copy. 25 No party filed an objection to Judge Beeler's report and recommendation.

26 Having reviewed Judge Beeler's report and recommendation, the Court hereby ADOPTS it 27 in part and **REJECTS** it in part. More specifically, the Court adopts Judge Beeler's

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

23

28

recommendation that the case be remanded for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Her analysis is
thorough and well reasoned on this issue.
The Court does not adopt Judge Beeler's recommendation to the extent she recommended

The Court does not adopt Judge Beeler's recommendation to the extent she recommended that Ms. Lopez's motion to proceed in forma pauperis be denied as moot. Because Ms. Lopez might be held accountable for at least the filing fee, the Court concludes that her motion for relief is not moot. Having reviewed Ms. Lopez's financial affidavit, the Court concludes that she has adequately established that she meets the economic eligibility requirement of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) and, accordingly, grants her application to proceed in forma pauperis. The Court, however, still remands the case because of the lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

10 The Clerk of the Court is directed to remand in accordance with this opinion and close the11 file in this case.

This order disposes of Docket Nos. 3, 6, 11, and 14.<sup>1</sup>

IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: August 2, 2012

## EDWARD M. CHEN United States District Judge

<sup>1</sup> In Docket No. 11, Louden asked that its motion to remand be heard on shortened time. Louden argued that "an order shortening time is necessary to effectuate the summary intent of California's unlawful detainer statutes." Docket No. 11 (Ex Parte App. at 2). Louden's motion is now moot in light of the Court's ruling herein.

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
- 3 4 5 6 7	LOUDEN LLC, Plaintiff, v. IGNACIO PAJARILLO et al, LOUDEN LLC, Case Number: CV12-02638 EMC CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
8	/ Defendant.
9 10	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.
11 12 13	That on August 2, 2012, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.
14 15	Ignacio J. Pajarillo 124 Valley Oak Lane Vallejo, CA 94591
16 17	Norma Lopez 124 Valley Oak Lane Vallejo, CA 94591
18 19 20	Dated: August 2, 2012 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: Betty Lee, Deputy Clerk
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26 27	
27 20	
28	2

**United States District Court** For the Northern District of California