

Case No. 5:09-CV-327 (HL)

1332. Generally, the court should defer to the value the plaintiff places on his claim. See Federated Mut. Ins. Co. v. McKinnon Motors, LLC, 329 F.3d 805, 807 (11th Cir. 2003). Ordinarily, “[i]t must appear to a legal certainty that the claim is really for less than the jurisdictional amount to justify dismissal.” Id. at 807 (quoting St. Paul Mercury Indem. Co. v. Red Cab Co. 303 U.S. 283, 289, 58 S.Ct. 586, 590 (1938)). “However, where jurisdiction is based on a claim for indeterminate damages, the Red Cab Co. ‘legal certainty’ test gives way, and the party seeking to invoke federal jurisdiction bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the claim on which it is basing jurisdiction meets the jurisdictional minimum.” Id.

In this case, the Plaintiff is asking for an indeterminate amount in damages. Thus, it is now incumbent upon the Plaintiff to come forward with evidence sufficient to show by a preponderance of the evidence that his claim meets the jurisdictional minimum. The Plaintiff is ordered to file with this Court, not later than July 2, 2010, evidence sufficient to show by a preponderance of the evidence that his claim is for more than \$75,000 or his Complaint will be dismissed. The Plaintiff’s filing shall be in the form of a brief with exhibits. The Defendant shall have ten days after service of the Plaintiff’s brief to respond to the Plaintiff’s brief. There will be no reply brief except by permission of this Court.

SO ORDERED, this the 22nd day of June, 2010.

jch

s/ Hugh Lawson

HUGH LAWSON, Senior Judge