Collins v. Xue et al Doc. 10

1 HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 8 AT SEATTLE 9 10 LAUREN M. COLLINS., CASE NO. C14-522 RAJ 11 Plaintiff, v. 12 **ORDER** 13 JIAN XIONG XUE, et al., 14 Defendants. 15 16 This matter comes before the court sua sponte. On April 15, 2014, the court 17 ordered plaintiff to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for lack of subject 18 matter jurisdiction. Dkt. # 6. The party asserting jurisdiction has the burden of 19 demonstrating jurisdictional facts. See U.S. v. Orr Water Ditch Co., 600 F.3d 1152, 1157 20 (9th Cir. 2010); Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 12(h)(3). 21 In her response, plaintiff mentions her disability and medical condition, but, again, 22 has not alleged any facts that tie the alleged discrimination to her medical condition or 23 disability. See 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (original jurisdiction over claims arising under federal

law). Additionally, plaintiff has not plausibly alleged diversity of citizenship jurisdiction

for her state law claims where all parties appear to be citizens of Washington State. 28

24

25

26

27

U.S.C. § 1332 (federal jurisdiction extends to "all civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds . . . \$75,000 . . . and is between . . . citizens of different States.").

Accordingly, having reviewed the record as a whole under the standards articulated in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) and having construed the allegations of the complaint liberally (*see Berhardt v. Los Angeles County*, 339 F.3d 920, 925 (9th Cir. 2003)), the court finds that plaintiff has not alleged facts sufficient (1) to give rise to a plausible cause of action cognizable under federal law or (2) to demonstrate that this court has jurisdiction based on diversity of citizenship.

For all the foregoing reasons, the court DISMISSES the complaint without prejudice.

Dated this 21st day of May, 2014.

The Honorable Richard A. Jones United States District Judge

Richard A Jane