

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

11 IDA 1 INC.; KIP DREAM HOMES INC.;  
12 ORCHID TERRACE INC.; 1 TO INFINITY  
LLC, dba 1 TO INFINITY DB PLAN,

Case No. C-13-02355-RMW

14 Plaintiffs.

## ORDER REMANDING CASE

15 || v.

[Re: Docket Nos. 3 and 8]

16 JOHN HAN CHIANG CHEN, aka JOHN H.  
17 CHEN; YANG HA CHEUNG; and Does 1 to  
20, inclusive,

18 Defendants.

20 On April 3, 2013, plaintiffs IDA 1 Inc., Kip Dream Homes Inc., and Orchid Terrace Inc.  
21 filed a complaint in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Santa Clara, alleging  
22 unlawful detainer under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1161a(b)(3). On the day that the  
23 eviction trial was scheduled to take place in state court, May 24, 2013, defendants John H. Chen  
24 and Yang Ha Cheung removed the case to federal court on the alleged basis of a federal question.  
25 Notice of Removal, Dkt. No. 1. On that same day, plaintiffs filed a motion to remand this case  
26 back to state court. Motion to Remand, Dkt. No. 3. The issue is whether a federal question is  
27 present in the Complaint that gives this court subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiffs' claim.

ORDER REMANDING CASE  
CASE NO. C-13-02355-RMW  
ALG

1 For the reasons set forth below, the court concludes that it lacks subject matter jurisdiction, and  
2 remands.

3 **I. BACKGROUND**

4 On March 15, 0213, plaintiffs purchased the subject property located in Santa Clara  
5 County at a foreclosure sale conducted pursuant to California Civil Code § 2924, and recorded  
6 the Trustee's Deed in the Santa Clara County Recorder's Office. Compl. ¶¶ 6, 7, Dkt. No. 1, Ex.  
7 A. On March 29, 2013, plaintiffs served a notice to quit on defendants, informing them that the  
8 property was sold and requiring them to vacate the property within three days. *Id.* ¶ 8.  
9 Defendants failed to vacate, and plaintiff filed an action for unlawful detainer requesting  
10 "immediate restitution of possession of the subject property," damages, and costs in state court.  
11 *Id.* ¶ 10. On the day of trial, more than thirty days after service of the complaint, defendants  
12 removed this action to federal court on the alleged basis of a federal question. On the same day,  
13 plaintiffs filed the present motion to remand. Plaintiffs then filed a motion requesting an  
14 expedited decision on its motion for remand.

15 **II. ANALYSIS**

16 Plaintiffs argue that defendants' notice of removal is both untimely and improper on its  
17 face. Defendants do not contest the fact that their removal was outside of the statutory thirty day  
18 timeframe for removal. Defendants simply argue that they did not intend to waive the right to  
19 remove. Defendants contend that plaintiffs' unlawful detainer action arises under the Protecting  
20 Tenants at Foreclosure Act of 2009, 12 U.S.C. § 5201 and that a federal question exists "as to  
21 whether there were violations of federal RESPA laws by the foreclosing parties." Opp'n 3-4, Dkt.  
22 No. 13.

23 The court agrees with plaintiffs that defendants' removal is both untimely and improper on  
24 its face, and is a clear attempt to delay the state court unlawful detainer trial. Defendants filed a  
25 notice of removal twenty days after the statutory deadline had passed, offering no explanation for  
26 the late filing. This alone warrants remand. 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b). Moreover, no federal question  
27 exists that gives rise to federal subject matter jurisdiction. Contrary to defendants' unfounded  
28 assertions, plaintiffs' unlawful detainer action states a claim only under California Code of Civil

1 Procedure § 1161a(b)(3), which does not raise any embedded federal question. *See Deutsche*  
2 *Bank Nat. Trust Co. v. Baltazar*, No. 12-2281 (PJH), 2012 WL 2159414, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. June  
3 13, 2012); *Wells Fargo Bank v. Kravits*, No. 11-05698 (LB), 2012 WL 216379, at \*2 (N.D. Cal.  
4 Jan. 24, 2012) ("Plaintiff correctly argues that its complaint asserts only a cause of action for  
5 unlawful detainer pursuant [to] . . . section 1161a(b)(3). . . . [I]n these circumstances, the PTFA  
6 does not create federal-question jurisdiction.").

7 Remand is proper because there is no federal question at issue in this case and the court  
8 lacks subject matter jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c). Because both parties will benefit from an  
9 expedient order on plaintiffs' motion to remand, the court deems this motion proper for a decision  
10 without a hearing, *see* Civ. L.R. 7-1(b), and GRANTS plaintiffs' motion to remand on the papers.

11 **III. CONCLUSION**

12 The court grants plaintiffs' motion to remand and hereby remands the case to the Superior  
13 Court of the State of California, County of Santa Clara.

14  
15 Dated: June 6, 2013  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

  
Ronald M. Whyte  
United States District Court Judge