## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

CAMI CAUBLE, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF OF HER MINOR SON, JAY ALLEN VEASMAN, JR. **CIVIL ACTION** 

**VERSUS** 

NO. 16-676-SDD-RLB

CANAL INSURANCE COMPANY, ET AL

## <u>ORDER</u>

The court *sua sponte* notes the potential insufficiency of the removing defendants' allegation of the citizenship of the parties as follows:

1.	X	A party invoking diversity jurisdiction must allege the <i>citizenship</i> of an individual. An individual's citizenship is determined by his or her domicile, rather than residence. <i>See Preston v. Tenet Healthsystem Memorial Medical Center, Inc.</i> , 485 F.3d 793, 799 (5th Cir. 2007). In addition, <i>see</i> 28 U.S.C. §1332(c)(2), for infants, the deceased and the incompetent. The <i>citizenship</i> of <b>Jay Allen Veasman, Jr.</b> is not provided.
2.		A party invoking diversity jurisdiction must allege both the state of incorporation and principal place of business <sup>1</sup> of each corporate party. <i>See, e.g., Illinois Central Gulf Railroad Co. v. Pargas, Inc.</i> , 706 F.2d 633 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983). The state of incorporation and principal place of business of is not provided.
3.		A party invoking diversity jurisdiction must allege both the state of incorporation and principal place of business of each corporate party. <i>See, e.g., Illinois Central Gulf Railroad Co. v. Pargas, Inc.,</i> 706 F.2d 633 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983). Even when a liability insurer takes on its insured's citizenship under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1), its own citizenship still is considered in determining whether complete diversity exists. The state of incorporation and principal place of business of is not provided. <sup>2</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The phrase "principal place of business" in §1332(c)(1) refers to the place where a corporation's high level officers direct, control, and coordinate the corporation's activities, *i.e.*, its "nerve center," which will typically be found at its corporate headquarters. *Hertz Corp. v. Friend*, 130 S.Ct. 1181, 175 L.Ed.2d 1029 (2010)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>See footnote 1.

4.		A party invoking diversity jurisdiction must properly allege the citizenship of a limited liability company. The citizenship of a limited liability company for
		diversity purposes is determined by the citizenship of its members. The
		citizenship of <b>all of the members</b> of a limited liability company must be properly alleged. In the event a member of a limited liability company is another limited
		liability company, the members of that limited liability company must be properly
		alleged as well. See <u>Harvey v. Grey Wolf Drilling Co.</u> , 542 F.3d 1077, 1080 (5 <sup>th</sup>
		<u>Cir. 2008</u> ). The complete citizenship of is not provided.
5.		A party invoking diversity jurisdiction must properly allege the citizenship of a
		general partnership, a limited liability partnership, and a limited partnership. A
		general partnership, a limited liability partnership, and a limited partnership has
		the citizenship of each one of its partners. Both the general partner and limited partner must be alleged to establish citizenship of a limited partnership. See
		International Paper Co. v. Denkmann Assoc., 116 F.3d 134, 137 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997);
		Carden v. Arkoma Associates, 494 U.S. 185 (1990). The citizenship of
		is not provided.
6.		A party invoking diversity jurisdiction must properly allege the citizenship of
		Underwriters at Lloyd's, London. The citizenship of Underwriters at Lloyd's,
		London has not been provided. See <u>Corfield v. Dallas Glen Hills LP</u> , 355 F.3d
		853 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003).
7.		A party invoking diversity jurisdiction must properly allege the citizenship of a
		sole proprietorship. A business entity cannot be both a corporation and sole proprietorship; therefore the court seeks to clarify the identity of
		plaintiff/defendant. Case law suggests that the citizenship of a sole proprietorship
		for diversity purposes is determined by the citizenship of its members and/or
		owners. See Linder Enterprises v. Martinringle, No. 07-1733, 2007 WL 3095382
		(N.D. Tex., Oct. 22, 2007). The citizenship of is not provided.
	Accor	dingly,
	IT IS	ORDERED, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1653, that, on or before October 31, 2016,
the p	laintiffs	shall file an amended complaint providing the citizenship of Jay Allen Veasman,
Ir 1	w setting	g forth all citizenship particulars required to sustain federal diversity jurisdiction.
<b>JI</b> •, L	y semme	5 rotal all chizoliship particulars required to sustain reductal diversity jurisdiction.

Signed in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, on October 19, 2016.

RICHARD L. BOURGEOIS, JR. UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE