

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
Northern District of California

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.,

No. C 12-06023 MEJ

Plaintiff,

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

v.

RUBY LOZADA,

Defendant.

On November 27, 2012, Defendant Ruby Lozada removed this unlawful detainer action from Solano 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 to show cause why this case should not be remanded to the Solano County Superior Court. Defendant shall file a declaration by March 7, 2013, and the Court shall conduct a hearing on March 21, 2013 at 10:00 a.m. in Courtroom B, 15th Floor, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California. In the declaration, Defendant must address how this Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff's unlawful detainer claim.

Defendant 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
2 jurisdiction on a federal court, even if the defense is that of federal preemption and is anticipated in
3 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 The February 28, 2013 Case Management Conference is VACATED.

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11
12 Dated: February 22, 2013



13 _____
14 Maria-Elena James
15 United States Magistrate Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 FOR THE
4 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

5 BANK OF AMERICA,

No. C 12-06023 MEJ

6 Plaintiff(s),

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

7 v.

8 RUBY LOZADA,

9 Defendant.

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 That on February 22, 2013, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said
12 copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said
13 envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located
14 in the Clerk's office.

15 Ruby Lozada
16 4941 Paramount Way
17 Fairfield, CA 94534

18 Dated: February 22, 2013

19 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
20 By: Rose Maher, Deputy Clerk