Bittle v. Peterson et al Doc. 9

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA FLORENCE DIVISION

| Mary Bittle, |) | |
|------------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Plaintiff, |) | ORDER |
| V. |) | C.A. 4:11-CV-03134-RBH |
| |) | |
| Steven Howard Peterson and Layer 3 |) | |
| Communications, LLC, |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

THIS MATTER COMES BEFORE THE COURT by way of the parties' consent motion to remand this matter to the South Carolina Court of Common Pleas for the Fourth Judicial Circuit, in Chesterfield County. The parties submit that Plaintiff has admitted by way of a binding stipulation that the amount in controversy is less than the \$75,000.00. As such the requisite amount for this Court to have jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 is not met. Therefore, based upon Plaintiff's stipulation, the parties have consented to have the matter remanded to the state court from which it was removed. For the foregoing reasons, the Court hereby grants the parties' consent motion to remand.

WHEREFORE, it is ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that this matter is hereby remanded to the South Carolina Court of Common Pleas for the Fourth Judicial Circuit, in Chesterfield County

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

<u>s/R. Bryan Harwell</u>The Honorable R. Bryan HarwellUnited States District Court Judge

Date: December 2, 2011