

United States District Court
Northern District of California

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BERNABE MORA,
Plaintiff,
v.
CHICAGO TITLE INSURANCE, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 5:15-cv-00590-RMW

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
DISMISS**

Re: Dkt. No. 14

Defendant Chicago Title Insurance (“Chicago”) moves to dismiss the complaint for Bernaba Mora (“Mora”) on several grounds, including lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The court submits the motion on the papers, and vacates the hearing set for April 17, 2015. Civil Local Rule 7-1(b). Because the court finds that it lacks subject matter jurisdiction over the complaint, the motion to dismiss is GRANTED.

Mora filed this complaint on February 6, 2015. This is at least the fifth complaint filed by Mora in federal court related to foreclosure, a trustee’s sale, and Mora’s eviction from a property located at 15601 Meridian Road, Castroville CA. See Case Nos. 10-CV-2854-LHK; 11-CV-2319-LHK; 12-CV-3259-LHK; 13-CV-1528-LHK. All four cases resulted in dismissals with prejudice for lack of jurisdiction. Mora generally alleges that a purchase at a trustee’s sale of the property was improper. The property was not owned by Mora, but by his son.

1 Mora brings claims to “void and cancel all misrepresented documents,” “to void and cancel
2 grant deeds,” “negligence or fraud,” and “quiet title.” Dkt. No. 1. None of these claims state a
3 federal cause of action. All of the causes of action identified in the caption of Plaintiff’s complaint
4 are based on state law. Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction, and Plaintiff has identified
5 no basis for the Court to exercise jurisdiction over these state law claims. Based on the
6 information in the complaint, there is no diversity between the parties, and the claims are not
7 based on violations of federal law. See 28 U.S.C. § 1332 (describing original federal jurisdiction
8 based on diversity); 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (describing original federal jurisdiction based on a federal
9 question). Without a source of federal jurisdiction, there is no basis for the Court to exercise
10 supplemental jurisdiction. See 28 U.S.C. § 1367. Accordingly, the motion to dismiss is
11 GRANTED.

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13 Dated: April 15, 2015

14 
15 Ronald M. Whyte
16 United States District Judge