## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

RICHARD W. YOO and JANE Y. YOO,

Case No.: 2:24-cv-00409-APG-MDC

**Plaintiffs** 

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

PROGRESSIVE DIRECT INSURANCE

Defendant

COMPANY,

**Order Remanding Case for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction** 

Defendant Progressive Direct Insurance Company removed this action based on diversity 10 jurisdiction. ECF No. 1. However, Progressive did not identify its principal place of business, so 11 I could not determine if complete diversity exists and Progressive did not show the amount in 12 controversy requirement has been satisfied. Consequently, I ordered Progressive to show cause 13 why this action should not be remanded to state court. ECF No. 4. Progressive did not timely 14 respond to the order to show cause. Even if I considered Progressive's statement regarding 15 removal as a response, it does not correct the identified deficiencies in the petition for removal. 16 ECF No. 7.

I THEREFORE ORDER that this action is remanded to the state court from which it was 18 removed for all further proceedings. The clerk of the court is instructed to close this case.

DATED this 26th day of March, 2024.

ANDREW P. GORDON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

22

17

19

20

21