1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16


17

18

19

20

21



V.

DEBORAH A. MATTHEWS, Defendant.

On June 12, 2012, the Defendant(s) removed this unlawful detainer action from Alameda County Superior Court. However, an unlawful detainer action does not arise under federal law but is purely a creature of California law. *Wells Fargo Bank v. Lapeen*, 2011 WL 2194117, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. June 6, 2011); *Wescom Credit Union v. Dudley*, 2010 WL 4916578, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 22, 2010). Thus, it appears that jurisdiction is lacking and the case should be remanded to state court. Accordingly, the Court ORDERS Defendant(s) to show cause why this case should not be remanded to the Alameda County Superior Court. Defendant(s) shall file a declaration by July 16, 2012, and the Court shall conduct a hearing on July 26, 2012 at 10:00 a.m. in Courtroom B, 15th Floor, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California. In the declaration, Defendant(s) must address how this Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff's unlawful detainer claim.

Defendant(s) should be mindful that an anticipated federal defense or counterclaim is not sufficient to confer jurisdiction. *Franchise Tax Bd. of California v. Construction Laborers Vacation Trust*, 463 U.S. 1, 10 (1983); *Berg v. Leason*, 32 F.3d 422, 426 (9th Cir.1994). "A case may not be removed to federal court on the basis of a federal defense, . . . even if the defense is anticipated in the plaintiff's complaint, and even if both parties admit that the defense is the only question truly at issue in the case." *ARCO Environmental Remediation, LLC v. Dept. of Health and Environmental Quality of the State of Montana*, 213 F.3d 1108, 1113 (9th Cir. 2000); *see also Valles v. Ivy Hill Corp.*, 410

1	F.3d 1071, 1075 (9th Cir. 2005) ("A federal law defense to a state-law claim does not confer
	jurisdiction on a federal court, even if the defense is that of federal preemption and is anticipated in
	the plaintiff's complaint."). Thus, any anticipated defense, such as a claim under the Protecting
4	Tenants at Foreclosure Act ("PTFA"), Pub.L. No. 111–22, § 702, 123 Stat. 1632 (2009), is not a valid
5	ground for removal. See e.g. Aurora Loan Services, LLC v. Montoya, 2011 WL 5508926, at *4
6	(E.D.Cal. Nov. 9, 2011); SD Coastline LP v. Buck, 2010 WL 4809661, at *2–3 (S.D.Cal. Nov.19,
7	2010); Wescom Credit Union v. Dudley, 2010 WL 4916578, at 2–3 (C.D.Cal. Nov. 22, 2010); Aurora
8	Loan Services, LLC v. Martinez, 2010 WL 1266887, at * 1 (N.D.Cal. March 29, 2010).
9	IT IS SO ORDERED.
10	Mi -
11	Dated: July 2, 2012
12	Maria-Elena James Chief United States Magistrate Judge
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23 24	
24 25	
25 26	
20	
28	
	2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT For the Northern District of California

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
3	CITIBANK N.A., No. C 12-03031 MEJ	
4	Plaintiff(s), CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
5	V.	
6	DEBORAH A. MATTHEWS,	
7	Defendant(s).	
8	/`	
9	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.	
10	That on July 2, 2012, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said	
11	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	ł
12	in the Clerk's office.	
13		
	Deborah A. Matthews 1334 Carleton Street	
15	Berkeley, CA 94702	
16		
	Dated: July 2, 2012 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk	
18	By: Rose Maher, Deputy Clerk	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23 24		
24 25		
25 26		
20 27		
27		
-0	3	

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT For the Northern District of California