

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: ROUNDUP PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL No. 2741
Case No. 16-md-02741-VC

This document relates to:

Acosta v. Monsanto Co., 18-cv-1960

**PRETRIAL ORDER NO. 162:
DENYING MOTION TO REMAND IN
ACOSTA V. MONSANTO CO.**

Dkt. No. 2674

Construing Acosta's notice of supplemental authority as a motion to remand, the motion is denied on timeliness grounds. Acosta filed the motion almost a year after her case was removed, and a violation of the forum-defendant rule is not a jurisdictional defect. *See Lively v. Wild Oats Markets, Inc.*, 456 F.3d 933, 942 (9th Cir. 2006); 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c) (setting a 30-day time limit for motions to remand).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: July 17, 2019



Honorable Vince Chhabria
United States District Court