

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

5
6 **ANTON A. RIVERA AND DENISE A. RIVERA,**

7 Plaintiffs,

8 v.

9 **JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A. et al.,**

10 Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-00636 YGR

**ORDER GRANTING DISMISSAL OF RICO
CLAIM; REMANDING CASE**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 15, 45

11 This removed action is before the Court based on federal question jurisdiction by virtue of the
12 RICO¹ claim alleged against all defendants in the FAC. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1331. On May 3, 2016, the
13 Court issued an order finding that the FAC did not adequately plead a RICO claim. (Dkt. No. 44.)

14 The Court afforded plaintiffs an opportunity to either amend or dismiss the RICO claim. (*See id.*)

15 Plaintiffs now elect the latter option and move to dismiss their RICO claim. (Dkt. No. 45.)

16 Good cause appearing, plaintiffs' motion is **GRANTED** and the RICO claim is **DISMISSED**. This Order
17 therefore disposes of the only federal claim in this case. Where "federal claims are dismissed before
18 trial...pendant state claims also should be dismissed." *See Jones v. Community Redevelopment*
19 *Agency of City of Los Angeles*, 733 F.2d 646, 651 (9th Cir. 1984). Accordingly, the Court **REMANDS**
20 the remainder of the action to the Contra Costa Superior Court.

21 This Order terminates Docket Numbers 15, 45 and terminates this case.

22 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

23 Dated: May 6, 2016

24
25 
YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

26
27
28 ¹ All terms shall have the same meaning as defined in the Court's prior order on plaintiffs'
motion to remand. (Dkt. No. 44.)