

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION**

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on review of the file. The Eighth Circuit has admonished district courts to “be attentive to a satisfaction of jurisdictional requirements in all cases.” *Sanders v. Clemco Indus.*, 823 F.2d 214, 216 (8th Cir. 1987). “In every federal case the court must be satisfied that it has jurisdiction before it turns to the merits of other legal arguments.” *Carlson v. Arrowhead Concrete Works, Inc.*, 445 F.3d 1046, 1050 (8th Cir. 2006). “A plaintiff who seeks to invoke diversity jurisdiction of the federal courts must plead citizenship distinctly and affirmatively.” 15 James Wm. Moore, et al., *Moore’s Federal Practice* § 102.31 (3d ed. 2010).

The Complaint in this case asserts that the Court has jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because the lawsuit is between citizens of different States and the matter in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000. Plaintiff is a Limited Liability Company (“LLC”). The Eighth Circuit has held that unincorporated entities such as LLCs are citizens of every state of which any member is a citizen. *See GMAC*

Commercial Credit, LLC v. Dillard Dep't Stores, Inc., 357 F.3d 827, 829 (8th Cir. 2004).

Thus, the Court must examine the citizenship of each member of the plaintiff to determine whether diversity jurisdiction exists. The Complaint contains no allegations concerning the members of the LLC.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, by September 22, 2017, plaintiff shall file an amended complaint in accordance with this memorandum.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if plaintiff does not timely and fully comply with this order, this matter will be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all other proceedings in this case are **STAYED** pending further order of this Court.

Dated this 1st day of September, 2017.



STEPHEN N. LIMBAUGH, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE