

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  
Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DODOCASE VR, INC., et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
MERCHSOURCE, LLC, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [17-cv-07088-AGT](#)  
**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE:  
SUBJECT-MATTER JURISDICTION**


Plaintiffs voluntarily amended their complaint earlier this year. In their operative, third amended complaint, they dropped all federal claims. The only remaining claim is a state-law claim for breach of a license agreement. Plaintiffs have asked the Court to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over this state-law claim, under 28 U.S.C. § 1367. See ECF No. 153, TAC ¶¶ 26–27.

When a plaintiff voluntarily amends his complaint to withdraw all federal claims, district courts cannot exercise supplemental jurisdiction over state-law claims that remain. See *Pintando v. Miami–Dade Housing Agency*, 501 F.3d 1241, 1242–44 (11th Cir. 2007); *Wellness Cmty.–Nat’l v. Wellness House*, 70 F.3d 46, 50 (7th Cir. 1995); see also 13D Charles A. Wright & Arthur R. Miller, *Federal Practice & Procedure* § 3567 & n. 50 (3d ed., updated Apr. 2020).

As federal subject-matter jurisdiction appears to be lacking, the Court orders the parties to show cause, by Monday, June 15, as to why this case shouldn’t be dismissed.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: May 29, 2020

  
ALEX G. TSE  
United States Magistrate Judge