

1 Plaintiff avers that this Court has diversity jurisdiction
2 over her case. Compl. ¶¶ 3-4. However, her complaint reflects
3 otherwise. Plaintiff alleges that she is a California resident.
4 Id. ¶ 5. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant JLM is a
5 California corporation with its corporate headquarters located in
6 Santa Ana, California. Id. ¶ 8. Accordingly, the requirement of
7 complete diversity is not satisfied. See 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1),
8 (c)(1); Lee v. Am. Nat. Ins. Co., 260 F.3d 997, 1004 (9th Cir.
9 2001) (citing Wisconsin Dept. of Corr. v. Schacht, 524 U.S. 381,
10 388 (1998); Strawbridge v. Curtiss, 7 U.S. (3 Cranch) 267 (1806))
11 ("The diversity jurisdiction statute, as construed for nearly 200
12 years, requires that to bring a diversity case in federal court
13 against multiple defendants, each plaintiff must be diverse from
14 each defendant.").

15 Accordingly, the Court hereby DISMISSES this case for lack of
16 subject-matter jurisdiction. Because the Court lacks jurisdiction
17 over this case, it does not reach Plaintiff's TRO application.

18

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20

21 Dated: November 13, 2012

22


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

23

24

25

26

27

28