

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 Northern District of California
5

6 LOUDEN, LLC,

No. C 13-4160 MEJ

7 Plaintiff,

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

8 v.

9 JAMES ANDERSON SR,

10 Defendant.
_____ /

11
12 On September 9, 2013, Defendant James Anderson, Sr. removed this unlawful detainer action
13 from Alameda County Superior Court. However, an unlawful detainer action does not arise under
14 federal law but is purely a creature of California law. *Wells Fargo Bank v. Lapeen*, 2011 WL
15 2194117, at *3 (N.D. Cal. June 6, 2011); *Wescom Credit Union v. Dudley*, 2010 WL 4916578, at *2
16 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 22, 2010). Thus, it appears that jurisdiction is lacking and the case should be
17 remanded to state court. Accordingly, the Court ORDERS Defendant to show cause why this case
18 should not be remanded to the Alameda County Superior Court. Defendant shall file a declaration by
19 September 26, 2013, and the Court shall conduct a hearing on October 10, 2013 at 10:00 a.m. in
20 Courtroom B, 15th Floor, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California. In the declaration,
21 Defendant must address how this Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff's unlawful detainer claim.

22 Defendant should be mindful that an anticipated federal defense or counterclaim is not
23 sufficient to confer jurisdiction. *Franchise Tax Bd. of California v. Construction Laborers Vacation*
24 *Trust*, 463 U.S. 1, 10 (1983); *Berg v. Leason*, 32 F.3d 422, 426 (9th Cir.1994). "A case may not be
25 removed to federal court on the basis of a federal defense, . . . even if the defense is anticipated in the
26 plaintiff's complaint, and even if both parties admit that the defense is the only question truly at issue
27 in the case." *ARCO Environmental Remediation, LLC v. Dept. of Health and Environmental Quality*
28 *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 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10
11 Dated: September 12, 2013



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

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LOUDEN LLC,

No. C 13-04160 MEJ

Plaintiff(s),

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

v.

JAMES ANDERSON SR,

Defendant.

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on September 12, 2013, 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.

James E. Anderson, Sr.
P.O. Box 1045
Oakland, CA 94604-1045

Dated: September 12, 2013

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