Feldman v. F	okertek, Inc.	Do
1		
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
3	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
4	***	
5		
6		
7	MARVIN ROY FELDMAN,	2:09-cv-01598-JCM-VCF
8	Plaintiff,	MINUTE ORDER
9	vs.	
10	POKERTEK, INC.,	
11	Defendant.	
12		
13	Presently before the court is defendant's Motion to Enforce Settlement Agreement (#83).	
14	Plaintiff filed his Opposition to Pokertek, Inc.'s Motion to Enforce Settlement Agreement (#84), and	
15	defendant filed its Reply in Support of Pokertek's Motion to Enforce Settlement Agreement (#85).	
16	Rule 12(h)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedures states, "If the court determines at any	
17	time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the court must dismiss the action."	
18	Paragraph 2 of Plaintiff's Complaint (#1)	and of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (#16)
19	allege, "This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332." Identifying the parties	
20	to establish Diversity Jurisdiction, plaintiff alleges in Paragraph 3 of Dockets #1 and #16, "Marvin Roy	
21	Feldman ("Feldman") is an American citizen permar	nently residing in Mexico."

25

Controlling Ninth Circuit and U. S. Supreme Court Authority holds that in order to be a citizen
of a State within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1332, a natural person must both be a citizen of the United
States and be domiciled within a state. A United States citizen permanently domiciled in Mexico is

Doc. 86

Dockets.Justia.com

1	neither a "citizen of a state" nor an "alien" for purposes of diversity jurisdiction. Newman-Green, Inc. v.
2	Alfonzo-Larrain, 490 U.S. 826 (1989); Brady v. Brown, 51 F.3d 810 (1995).
3	On this record, it appears that plaintiff Marvin Roy Feldman is "stateless" for purposes of 28
4	U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1) and subsection 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(2) cannot confer jurisdiction on this court
5	because plaintiff is a United States citizen.
6	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties have until March 29, 2013, to file
7	points and authorities establishing that this action is within the subject-matter jurisdiction of this court.
8	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any party wishing to oppose positions asserted in the filings
9	due on March 29, 2013, must file a response on or before April 10, 2013.
10	Dated this 13th day of March, 2013.
11	CAM FERENBACH
12	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	2