



1 matter jurisdiction (Doc. #36) which was granted by the court (Doc. #42). Thereafter, Johnson filed  
2 the present motion for reconsideration. Doc. #53.

### 3 **II. Discussion**

4 Johnson brings his motion for relief from judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b).  
5 Rule 60(b) provides that a district court may relieve a party from a final judgment or order. Relief  
6 from judgment is appropriate upon a showing of mistake, newly discovered evidence, fraud, or  
7 excusable neglect. FED. R. CIV. P. 60(b); *see also, Bateman v. U.S. Postal Service*, 231 F.3d 1220,  
8 1223 (9th Cir. 2000). In his motion, Johnson argues relief is appropriate because the court based its  
9 finding that it could not exercise diversity jurisdiction, and therefore, there was no subject matter  
10 jurisdiction over his complaint, on the citizenship of parties who are not defendants in this action.  
11 *See* Doc. #53.

12 In the court's July 20, 2010 order granting defendants' motion to dismiss for lack of subject  
13 matter jurisdiction, the court held that it could not exercise diversity jurisdiction in this action  
14 under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1) because Johnson's complaint alleged that he, along with defendants  
15 Comfort; Truckee River Highlands HOA, LLC; Don Glenn; Janet Kraustrunk; and Incline Property  
16 Management, LLC are all citizens of the state of Nevada. Doc. #42. In that order, the court erred in  
17 finding that Truckee River Highlands HOA, LLC; Don Glenn; Janet Kraustrunk; and Incline  
18 Property Management, LLC were defendants in this action. These parties are defendants in another  
19 action involving Johnson and are not defendants in this action. Therefore, their citizenship was  
20 improperly addressed by the court in its discussion of diversity jurisdiction.

21 However, Comfort, who is a defendant in this action and was addressed in the court's order,  
22 is a company incorporated in the state of Nevada. Further its citizenship has not been challenged  
23 by Johnson. Thus, even though the court addressed the citizenship of individuals who are not  
24 defendants in this action, the court's finding that it could not exercise diversity jurisdiction is  
25 proper because there is still no true diversity between the parties. Accordingly, the court shall deny  
26

1 Johnson's motion for reconsideration.

2

3 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Doc. #53) is  
4 DENIED.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 DATED this 22nd day of September, 2010.



7

8

---

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