eBay (UK) Limited v. Gravity4, Inc.

Doc. 16

under the diversity of citizenship statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). Complaint, ECF 1, ¶ 12. Generally speaking, that statute provides that jurisdiction is satisfied if there is complete diversity of citizenship between the parties and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.

Here, plaintiff eBay (UK) Limited alleges that it is a "foreign corporation organized under the laws of the United Kingdom with its principal place of business in London, England." Complaint ¶ 10. Defendant Gravity4, Inc. is alleged to be a "foreign corporation organized under the laws of Delaware, previously authorized to do business in the state of California and the state of Florida, with former principal place of business in San Francisco, California, and Miami, Florida." Complaint ¶ 11. The Complaint does not expressly say where Gravity4 is incorporated and where its principal place of business was at the time of the Complaint. Plaintiff demands more than \$2 million in compensatory damages, so the "amount in controversy" threshold is easily exceeded. Complaint, Prayer for Relief at p. 6:9.

The unresolved question is whether there is complete diversity of citizenship between the parties. A few foundational concepts underlie this analysis.

First, citizenship for a corporation is determined under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1): "a corporation shall be deemed to be a citizen of every State and foreign state by which it has been incorporated and of the State or foreign state where it has its principal place of business."

Second, diversity jurisdiction does not encompass a suit between two foreign corporations. Cheng v. Boeing, 708 F.2d 1406, 1412 (9th Cir. 1983); see 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a).

And third, diversity is determined at the time the action is filed. Smith v. Snerling, 354 U.S. 91, 93 n.1 (1957). Plaintiff's allegations about Gravity4's "former" principal places of business are therefore jurisdictionally irrelevant. Complaint ¶ 11.

At bottom, given that paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Complaint allege that both plaintiff and defendant are "foreign corporations," it appears that complete diversity is not

United States District Court Northern District of California

established. Plaintiff is ordered to show cause in writing by July 1, 2019, as to why this
case should not be dismissed, and the motion for default judgment denied, due to lack or
subject matter jurisdiction. If plaintiff seeks to amend the Complaint to address the
subject matter jurisdiction question, it must do so by July 1. The CMC and hearing on
default judgment are both continued from June 19 to July 10, 2019, at 1:00 p.m. in San
Jose courtroom 5. Plaintiff is ordered to serve on Gravity4: the motion for default
judgment, this Order, its response to the Order to Show Cause, and any amended
Complaint. Plaintiff must file a certificate of service by July 8.
IT IS SO ORDERED.
Ā A = = -
Dated: June 17, 2019
NATHANAEL M. COUSINS United States Magistrate Judge