

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  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANTONIO GUTIERREZ,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF  
AGRICULTURE, *et al.*,  
Defendants.

---

Civil No. 09cv125-L(BLM)  
**ORDER DISMISSING ACTION FOR  
LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER  
JURISDICTION**

Plaintiff filed this action to quiet title to his property and declare right to possession. He also asserted claims for fraud, negligent misrepresentation, unfair business practices, constructive trust and attorney malpractice under California law. The court initially had subject matter jurisdiction over the action because United States Department of Agriculture (“USDA”) was a named Defendant who held a deed of trust on Plaintiff’s property. On March 31, 2009 Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed the USDA. He subsequently dismissed several additional Defendants. The only Defendants remaining in the case are Marco J. Rodriguez and Gabriel Doe.

The federal court is one of limited jurisdiction. *See Gould v. Mutual Life Ins. Co. of N.Y.*, 790 F.2d 769, 774 (9th Cir. 1986). It possesses only the power authorized by the Constitution or a statute. *See Bender v. Williamsport Area Sch. Dist.*, 475 U.S. 534, 541 (1986). It is constitutionally required to raise issues related to federal subject matter jurisdiction and may do

1 so sua sponte. *Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env't*, 523 U.S. 83, 93-94 (1998); see *Indus.*  
2 *Tectonics, Inc. v. Aero Alloy*, 912 F.2d 1090, 1092 (9th Cir. 1990).

3 Because the USDA is no longer a Defendant, the court has dismissed all claims over  
4 which it has original jurisdiction. The only remaining Defendants are Marco J. Rodriguez,  
5 Plaintiff's former attorney, and Gabriel Doe, Mr. Rodriguez' assistant. Plaintiff alleges state law  
6 claims for fraud, negligent misrepresentation and attorney malpractice against them. Pursuant to  
7 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c) the court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over these claims.

8 Accordingly, this action is hereby **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for lack of  
9 subject matter jurisdiction.

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11  
12 DATED: June 30, 2009

13  
14   
M. James Lorenz  
United States District Court Judge

15 COPY TO:

16 HON. BARBARA LYNN MAJOR  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

17 ALL PARTIES/COUNSEL  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28