Downtown Action to Save Housing v. Midland Corporate Tax Credit XIV, LP et al			
1	TH	E HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR	
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
8	AT SEATTLE		
9	DOWNTOWN ACTION TO SAVE HOUSING,	CASE NO. C18-0138-JCC	
10	Plaintiff,	MINUTE ORDER	
11	V.		
12	MIDLAND CORPORATE TAX CREDIT XIV, <i>et al.</i> ,		
13	Defendants.		
14	Defendants.		
15	The following Minute Order is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable John C.		
16	Coughenour, United States District Judge:		
17	This matter comes before the Court on Defendants' diversity disclosure (Dkt. No. 42).		
18	The disclosure is not sufficient to satisfy the Court that it has jurisdiction over this case. For		
19	example, Defendant Midland Corporate Tax Credit XVI, LP, lists as a general partner MEC		
20	Newco, LLC, but does not provide any information about the members of Newco, LLC. (See		
21	Dkt. No. 42 at 2.) As another example, Defendant Midland Corporate Tax Credit XIV, LP lists		
22	as a limited partner Birch Institutional Tax Credits III, LLC, but does not provide any		
23	information about the members of that LLC. (<i>Id.</i>)		
24			

A partnership, limited partnership ("LP"), limited liability partnership ("LLP"), and limited liability company ("LLC") are all citizens of every state of which its partners or members

MINUTE ORDER C18-0138-JCC PAGE - 1

25

26

Doc. 43

are citizens. See Johnson v. Columbia Props. Anchorage, LP, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006). If a partner or member is itself a partnership, LP, LLP, or LLC, that analysis should be reapplied. See id. In other words, if the partners of a defendant partnership are themselves partnerships, LPs, or LLPs, the partners of those partners must also be alleged. Likewise, if the partners of a defendant partnership are themselves LLCs, the members of those LLCs must also be alleged. Defendants must disclose the members or partners of all partnerships, LPs, LLPs, and LLCs until each Defendant partnership can be traced to a group of individuals and entities that are not partnerships, LPs, LLPs, or LLCs. Once Defendants have done so, Defendants must disclose the citizenship of those individuals and entities. See Lindley Contours, LLC v. AABB Fitness Holdings, Inc., 414 Fed. App'x. 62, 65 (9th Cir. 2011) (remanding case to district court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction based on defendants' failure to "identify of what state they are a citizen ... [and] whether they are composed of another layer of partnerships.")

For purposes of diversity jurisdiction, a corporation is a citizen of its state of incorporation and its principal place of business, so Defendants must allege both. See 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1). Additionally, a national bank is a citizen of the state in which its main office, as set forth in its articles of association, is located. See Wachovia Bank v. Schmidt, 546 U.S. 303, 306-07 (2006).

In accordance with the aforementioned instructions, Defendants are ORDERED to trace their memberships to entities that are not partnerships, LPs, LLPs, or LLCs, and are ORDERED to file an additional disclosure (1) outlining that tracing and (2) disclosing the identifiable citizenship of each Defendant. Defendants shall file this additional disclosure by February 6, 2019. The Clerk is DIRECTED to re-note Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 24) and Defendants' cross motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 22) to February 6, 2019.

> MINUTE ORDER C18-0138-JCC PAGE - 2

//

//

//

1

1		
1	DATED this 23rd day of January 2019.	
2	William M. McCool Clerk of Court	
3		
4	<u>s/Tomas Hernandez</u> Deputy Clerk	
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
	MINUTE ORDER C18-0138-JCC PAGE - 3	