

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO  
Chief Judge Philip A. Brimmer

Civil Action No. 19-cv-02326-PAB

HOLLY GOULD,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

---

The Court takes up this matter *sua sponte* on defendant Union Pacific Railroad Company's Notice of Removal [Docket No. 1]. Defendant asserts that this Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Docket No. 1 at 3, ¶ 12.

In every case and at every stage of the proceeding, a federal court must satisfy itself as to its own jurisdiction, even if doing so requires *sua sponte* action. See *Citizens Concerned for Separation of Church & State v. City & County of Denver*, 628 F.2d 1289, 1297 (10th Cir. 1980). Absent an assurance that jurisdiction exists, a court may not proceed in a case. See *Cunningham v. BHP Petroleum Great Britain PLC*, 427 F.3d 1238, 1245 (10th Cir. 2005). Courts are well-advised to raise the issue of jurisdiction on their own, regardless of parties' apparent acquiescence. First, it is the Court's duty to do so. *Tuck v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 859 F.2d 842, 844 (10th Cir. 1988). Second, regarding subject matter jurisdiction, "the consent of the parties is irrelevant, principles of estoppel do not apply, and a party does not waive the

requirement by failing to challenge jurisdiction.” *Ins. Corp. of Ireland v. Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinee*, 456 U.S. 694, 702 (1982) (internal citations omitted). Finally, delay in addressing the issue only compounds the problem if, despite much time and expense having been dedicated to the case, a lack of jurisdiction causes it to be dismissed. See *U.S. Fire Ins. Co. v. Pinkard Constr. Co.*, No. 09-cv-00491-PAB-MJW, 2009 WL 2338116, at \*3 (D. Colo. July 28, 2009).

“The party invoking federal jurisdiction bears the burden of establishing such jurisdiction as a threshold matter.” *Radil v. Sanborn W. Camps, Inc.*, 384 F.3d 1220, 1224 (10th Cir. 2004). Defendant asserts that this Court has diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Pursuant to that section, “district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between . . . citizens of different States.” 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). “For purposes of federal diversity jurisdiction, an individual’s state citizenship is equivalent to domicile.” *Smith v. Cummings*, 445 F.3d 1254, 1259 (10th Cir. 2006). “To establish domicile in a particular state, a person must be physically present in the state and intend to remain there.” *Id.* at 1260. The facts presently alleged are insufficient to establish plaintiff’s citizenship.

The Notice of Removal alleges that plaintiff “is a citizen of Colorado.” Docket No. 1 at 3, ¶ 12. However, the evidence upon which defendant relies to establish plaintiff’s citizenship – namely, plaintiff’s state court complaint, see Docket No. 1-2 – does not support defendant’s allegations. In her complaint, plaintiff does not allege that she is a citizen of Colorado. Instead, the complaint states that plaintiff is a “resident of Jefferson

County . . . , Colorado.” Docket No. 1-2 at 1, ¶ 1. Residency is not synonymous with domicile, see *Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians v. Holyfield*, 490 U.S. 30, 48 (1989) (“‘Domicile’ is not necessarily synonymous with ‘residence,’ and one can reside in one place but be domiciled in another.”) (citations omitted), and only the latter is determinative of a party’s citizenship. See *Whitelock v. Leatherman*, 460 F.2d 507, 514 (10th Cir. 1972) (“[A]llegations of mere ‘residence’ may not be equated with ‘citizenship’ for the purposes of establishing diversity.”).

Because the allegations are presently insufficient to allow the Court to determine the citizenship of plaintiff and whether the Court has jurisdiction, see *United States ex rel. General Rock & Sand Corp. v. Chuska Dev. Corp.*, 55 F.3d 1491, 1495 (10th Cir. 1995) (“The party seeking the exercise of jurisdiction in his favor must allege in his pleading the facts essential to show jurisdiction.” (internal quotation marks omitted)), it is

**ORDERED** that, on or before **October 18, 2019**, defendant Union Pacific Railroad Company shall show cause why this case should not be remanded to state court due to the Court’s lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

DATED October 8, 2019.

BY THE COURT:

s/Philip A. Brimmer  
PHILIP A. BRIMMER  
Chief United States District Judge