

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

DIMITRITZA TOROMANOVA)

Plaintiff,)

v.)

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.; et al.,)

Defendants.)

2:12-cv-1637-LRH-CWH

ORDER

Before the court is plaintiff Dimitritza Toromanova’s (“Toromanova”) objections to the court’s orders which the court shall construe as a motion for reconsideration. Doc. #52.¹

I. Facts and Background

Plaintiff Toromanova filed a complaint in state court against defendants for wrongful foreclosure. *See* Doc. #1, Exhibit A. Defendants removed the action to federal court on the basis of diversity jurisdiction. Doc. #1. Thereafter, Toromanova filed the present motion for reconsideration. Doc. #52.

II. Discussion

In her motion, Toromanova contends that this court is without jurisdiction to hear this action, and therefore, all of the court’s orders were in error. The court disagrees. As addressed at length in the court’s order denying Toromanova’s motion to remand, the exercise of diversity

¹ Refers to the court’s docket entry number.

1 jurisdiction is appropriate because there is complete diversity between the parties. *See* Doc. #34.
2 Thus, it was not error for the court to exercise jurisdiction in this action and enter its prior orders.
3 Accordingly, the court shall deny her objections.
4

5 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's objection to the court's orders (Doc. #52) is
6 DENIED.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 DATED this 27th day of September, 2013.



LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26