

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

Rather, “the federal question must ‘be disclosed upon the face of the complaint, unaided by the answer.’” *Provincial Gov’t of Marinduque*, 582 F.3d at 1086 (quoting *Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Texaco Inc.*, 415 U.S. 125, 127-28 (1974)). Because Plaintiff’s complaint for unlawful detainer raises no federal claims, there appears to be no basis for removal and no subject matter jurisdiction in this Court. *See, e.g., Litton Loan Servicing, L.P. v. Villegas*, C 10-05478 PJH, 2011 WL 204322 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2011); *Partners v. Gonzalez*, C-10-02598 EDL, 2010 WL 3447678 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 30, 2010).

Accordingly, the unlawful detainer action is hereby REMANDED to Santa Clara County Superior Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 6, 2013



LUCY H. KOH
United States District Judge