

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

without requesting that the court retain jurisdiction over enforcement of the settlement agreement.³
Plaspro admitted in its motion papers and at the motion hearing that the amount in controversy for
its breach of settlement agreement action is less than \$75,000.⁴ Accordingly, the court lacks
jurisdiction over Plaspro's motion and the motion is DENIED. The court regrets the obvious
inefficiency in this outcome, as well as the likely passing of this dispute to the burdened dockets of
the state courts. But this court's subject matter jurisdiction is non-discretionary.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 16, 2013



PAUL S. GREWAL
United States Magistrate Judge

³ See Docket No. 117.

⁴ See Docket No. 123 at 2.