1 RECEIVED 2 MAY 1 0 2010 3 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA DEPUTY 4) indial light ballt baldt bildt itale iblit blat ibnt 5 6 10-CV-05194-ORD 7 8 9 10 11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT** 12 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA 13 HAROLD JOHNSON. NO. 3:10-cv-05194RBL 14 Plaintiff, **ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S** 15 **MOTION FOR REMAND** VS. 16 TTI FLOOR CARE NORTH AMERICA 17 d/b/a ROYAL APPLIANCE MFG. COMPANY, Ohio companies transacting 18 business in Washington, 19 Defendant. 20 21

THIS MATTER is before the Court upon Plaintiff's Motion to Remand[Dkt. #9], based on Plaintiff's claim that the amount in controversy is less than the jurisdictional minimum \$75,000.00. Under *Gaus v. Miles*, 980 F.2d 564, 567 (9th Cir.1992) and numerous other authorities, the party asserting federal jurisdiction has the burden of proof on a motion to remand to state court. *See also, for example, Conrad Associates v. Hartford Accident* &

ORDER GRANTING PLNTF'S MOTION FOR REMAND - 1

22

23

24

25

26

| 1 | Indemnity Co., 994 F. Supp. 1196 (N.D. Cal. 1998). The removal statute is strictly |
|----|--|
| 2 | construed against removal jurisdiction. The strong presumption against removal |
| 3 | jurisdiction means that the defendant has the burden of establishing removal is proper. |
| 4 | Conrad, 994 F. Supp. At 1198. It is obligated to do so by a preponderance of the |
| 5 | |
| 6 | evidence. Id. at 1199; see also Gaus v. Miles. Federal jurisdiction must be rejected if |
| 7 | there is any doubt as to the right of removal in the first instance. Id. At 566. |
| 8 | The Defendant's reliance on Plaintiff's initial settlement demand is insufficient to meet |
| 9 | this burden, where the Complaint and subsequent statements undermine the claim that the |
| 10 | amount in controversy is sufficient. |
| 11 | · |
| 12 | It is therefore ORDERED that, pursuant to 28 USC 1447, the Motion [Dkt. #9] is |
| 13 | GRANTED this matter is hereby REMANDED to the Pierce County Superior Court. The |
| 14 | Court will not award fees on this remand. The Clerk is directed to send uncertified copies |
| 15 | of this Order to all counsel of record. The Clerk is further directed to send certified copies |
| 16 | of this order to the Clerk of the Court for Pierce County Superior Court. |
| 17 | .1.4 |
| 18 | DATED this day of May, 2010. |
| 19 | -7253 Celi |
| 20 | THE HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON |
| 21 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| | |

24

25

26