24 NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file	1			
4 5 6 7 8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA 9 RONALD D. JOHNSTON, 10 11 v. 12 ATLANTIC CONTINGENCY 13 CONSTRUCTORS, LLC, a Louisiana Limited Liability Company; GENERAL MECHANICAL, INC., a Washington corporation; and NESS & CAMPBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington 15 16 17 18 This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of the parties, (see Joint Status Report, ECF No. 21; Order on Consent, ECF No. 22), Fed. R. Ci P. 73, and Local Magistrate Judges' Rules MJR 1 and MJR 13. 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 17 18 19 113 114 115 115 116 117 118 119 119 1110 11111 11111	2			
5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 9 RONALD D. JOHNSTON, 10 Plaintiff, 11 v. 2 ATLANTIC CONTINGENCY 13 CONSTRUCTORS, LLC, a Louisiana 14 MECHANICAL, INC., a Washington 15 corporation; and NESS & CAMPBELL 16 Defendants. 17 This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of 18 This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of 19 the parties, (see Joint Status Report, ECF No. 21; Order on Consent, ECF No. 22), Fed. R. Ci 12 P. 73, and Local Magistrate Judges' Rules MJR 1 and MJR 13. 13 This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case shou 13 not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendant 13 NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file 14 NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file 15 response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over th	3			
6 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 9 RONALD D. JOHNSTON, 10 Plaintiff, 11 v. 12 ATLANTIC CONTINGENCY 13 CONSTRUCTORS, LLC, a Louisiana 14 MECHANICAL, INC., a Washington 15 corporation; and NESS & CAMPBELL 16 Defendants. 17 This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of 18 This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of 19 the parties, (see Joint Status Report, ECF No. 21; Order on Consent, ECF No. 22), Fed. R. Ci 12 P. 73, and Local Magistrate Judges' Rules MJR 1 and MJR 13. 13 This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case shou 13 not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendart 13 NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file 14 NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation is proper over the	4			
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA 9 RONALD D. JOHNSTON, 10 Plaintiff, 11 v. 12 ATLANTIC CONTINGENCY 13 CONSTRUCTORS, LLC, a Louisiana Limited Liability Company; GENERAL MECHANICAL, INC., a Washington corporation; and NESS & CAMPBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington corporation. ORDER REGARDING ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE 18 This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of the parties, (see Joint Status Report, ECF No. 21; Order on Consent, ECF No. 22), Fed. R. Ci P. 73, and Local Magistrate Judges' Rules MJR 1 and MJR 13. 19 This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case shou not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendard NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the	5			
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA 9 RONALD D. JOHNSTON, 10 Plaintiff, 11 v. 12 ATLANTIC CONTINGENCY 13 CONSTRUCTORS, LLC, a Louisiana Limited Liability Company; GENERAL MECHANICAL, INC., a Washington corporation; and NESS & CAMPBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington corporation. ORDER REGARDING ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE 14 MECHANICAL, INC., a Washington corporation; and NESS & CAMPBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington corporation. Other period 16 Defendants. Defendants. 17	6			
 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA RONALD D. JOHNSTON, Plaintiff, v. ATLANTIC CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTORS, LLC, a Louisiana Limited Liability Company; GENERAL MECHANICAL, INC., a Washington corporation; and NESS & CAMPBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington corporation. Defendants. This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of the parties, (see Joint Status Report, ECF No. 21; Order on Consent, ECF No. 22), Fed. R. Ci P. 73, and Local Magistrate Judges' Rules MJR 1 and MJR 13. This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case shou not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendant NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the 	7	UNITED STATES DIST	TRICT COURT	
9 RONALD D. JOHNSTON, 10 Plaintiff, 11 v. 12 ATLANTIC CONTINGENCY 13 CONSTRUCTORS, LLC, a Louisiana 14 MECHANICAL, INC., a Vashington 15 corporation; and NESS & CAMPBELL 16 Defendants. 17 Inits Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of 18 This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of 19 the parties, (see Joint Status Report, ECF No. 21; Order on Consent, ECF No. 22), Fed. R. Ci 12 P. 73, and Local Magistrate Judges' Rules MJR 1 and MJR 13. 13 This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case shou 13 not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendant 13 NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file 14 NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file 15 response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the	8	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
10 Plaintiff, 11 v. 12 ATLANTIC CONTINGENCY 13 CONSTRUCTORS, LLC, a Louisiana 14 MECHANICAL, INC., a Vashington 15 corporation; and NESS & CAMPBELL 16 Defendants. 17 1 18 This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of 19 the parties, (see Joint Status Report, ECF No. 21; Order on Consent, ECF No. 22), Fed. R. Ci 18 This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case shou 10 not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendart 12 NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file 13 response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the subject matter jurisdict	9			
11 v. 12 ATLANTIC CONTINGENCY 13 ATLANTIC CONTINGENCY 14 CONSTRUCTORS, LLC, a Louisiana 14 MECHANICAL, INC., a Washington 15 corporation; and NESS & CAMPBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington corporation. Defendants. 16 Defendants. 17 11 18 This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of the parties, (see Joint Status Report, ECF No. 21; Order on Consent, ECF No. 22), Fed. R. Ci 10 P. 73, and Local Magistrate Judges' Rules MJR 1 and MJR 13. 11 This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case shou 13 not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendart 14 NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file 15 response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the subject matter intermation of the remainded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the subject matter intermation of the remainded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the subject matter jurisdiction is proper ov	10		ASE NO. C10-5643-JRC	
12 ATLANTIC CONTINGENCY 13 CONSTRUCTORS, LLC, a Louisiana 14 Limited Liability Company; GENERAL 15 corporation; and NESS & CAMPBELL 16 Defendants. 17 18 18 This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of 19 the parties, (see Joint Status Report, ECF No. 21; Order on Consent, ECF No. 22), Fed. R. Ci 10 P. 73, and Local Magistrate Judges' Rules MJR 1 and MJR 13. 12 This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case shou 13 not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendart 12 NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file 13 response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the	11		RDER REGARDING ORDER TO	
 CONSTRUCTORS, LLC, a Louisiana Limited Liability Company; GENERAL MECHANICAL, INC., a Washington corporation; and NESS & CAMPBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington corporation. Defendants. This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of the parties, (see Joint Status Report, ECF No. 21; Order on Consent, ECF No. 22), Fed. R. Ci P. 73, and Local Magistrate Judges' Rules MJR 1 and MJR 13. This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case shou not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendant NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the 	12	S		
 MECHANICAL, INC., a Washington corporation; and NESS & CAMPBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington corporation. Defendants. This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of the parties, (see Joint Status Report, ECF No. 21; Order on Consent, ECF No. 22), Fed. R. Ci P. 73, and Local Magistrate Judges' Rules MJR 1 and MJR 13. This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case shou not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendant NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the 	13	CONSTRUCTORS, LLC, a Louisiana		
 CRANE, INC., a Washington corporation. Defendants. This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of the parties, (see Joint Status Report, ECF No. 21; Order on Consent, ECF No. 22), Fed. R. Ci P. 73, and Local Magistrate Judges' Rules MJR 1 and MJR 13. This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case shou not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendar NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the 	14			
16 Defendants. 17	15			
 This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of the parties, (see Joint Status Report, ECF No. 21; Order on Consent, ECF No. 22), Fed. R. Ci P. 73, and Local Magistrate Judges' Rules MJR 1 and MJR 13. This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case shou not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendar NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the 	16			
 This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of the parties, (see Joint Status Report, ECF No. 21; Order on Consent, ECF No. 22), Fed. R. Ci P. 73, and Local Magistrate Judges' Rules MJR 1 and MJR 13. This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case shou not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendar NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has filed response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the 	17			
 the parties, (see Joint Status Report, ECF No. 21; Order on Consent, ECF No. 22), Fed. R. Ci P. 73, and Local Magistrate Judges' Rules MJR 1 and MJR 13. This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case shou not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendar NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the 	18	This Court has jurisdiction over this issue pur	rsuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) on consent of	
 P. 73, and Local Magistrate Judges' Rules MJR 1 and MJR 13. This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case shou not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendar NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the 	19			
 This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case shou not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendar NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the 	20			
 not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendar NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the 	21			
 NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has file response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the 	22	This case is before this Court on the Court's Order to Show Cause why this case should		
²⁵ response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over th	23	not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) Defendant		
response. (ECF No. 25.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over the	24	NESS & CAMBELL CRANE, INC., a Washington Corporation (hereinafter "Ness") has filed a		
26	25	response. (ECF No. 23.) The Court concludes that subject matter jurisdiction is proper over this		
	26			

case because the personal injury allegedly arose from an incident on a federal enclave -- Fort Lewis.

BACKGROUND

According to the Complaint (see ECF No. 1), plaintiff, RONALD D. JOHNSTON (hereinafter "Johnston"), was a civilian employee for the Public Works, O & M Division, Waste Water Plant, at the Fort Lewis Waste Water Treatment Plant in Fort Lewis, Pierce County, Washington. (ECF No. 1, at p. 13.) On or about April 5, 2009, plaintiff reported for work at the Fort Lewis Waste Water Treatment Plant. (<u>Id.</u> at 15.) While walking on the premises, plaintiff allegedly tripped over a length of cable that had been stretched across the walkway. (<u>Id.</u>) Plaintiff alleges that this cable was being used by defendants in conjunction with construction being done on the premises. (<u>See id.</u>) Plaintiff, among other allegations, alleges that each of the defendants were negligent in failing to provide a reasonably safe working and construction environment. (<u>Id.</u>) Plaintiff alleges various types of injuries and damages allegedly sustained as a direct and proximate result of defendants' negligence. (<u>Id.</u> at pp. 15-16.)

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On or about August 5, 2010, plaintiff filed a complaint against defendants in Pierce County Superior Court. (See ECF No. 1, at pp. 5-16.) On or about September 8, 2010, defendant Ness filed a Notice of Removal of Action. (See id. at pp. 1-3.) On December 1, 2010, this Court issued an Order to Show Cause why this case should not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 16.) On December 13, 2010, defendant Ness filed its Response to Order to Show Cause. (ECF No. 23.) In its Response, Ness contends that removal is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331. No party has objected to the removal.

ORDER - 2

DISCUSSION

According to the United States Supreme Court, only "state-court actions that originally could have been filed in federal court may be removed to federal court by the defendant." <u>Caterpillar, Inc. v. Williams</u>, 482 U.S. 386, 392 (1987). Whether or not federal-question jurisdiction is present "is governed by the 'well-pleaded complaint rule,' which provides that federal jurisdiction exists only when a federal question is presented on the face of the plaintiff's properly pleaded complaint." <u>Id.</u> (*citing* <u>Gully v. First National Bank</u>, 299 U.S. 109, 112-13 (1936)). In addition, "[f]ederal courts have federal question jurisdiction over tort claims that arise on 'federal enclaves.'" <u>Durham v. Lockheed Martin Corp.</u>, 445 F.3d 1247, 1250 (9th Cir. 2006) (*citing* 28 U.S.C. § 1331; <u>Willis v. Craig</u>, 555 F.2d 724, 726 n.4 (9th Cir. 1977) (per curiam); <u>Mater v. Holley</u>, 200 F.2d 123, 125 (5th Cir. 1952)). For the purposes of federal question jurisdiction, federal enclaves exist where property is "purchased for the Erection of Forts." <u>Willis</u>, 555 F.2d at 726 (*quoting* U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 17).

In this case, plaintiff's complaint alleges that plaintiff suffered an injury on the grounds of the Fort Lewis Waste Water Treatment Plant. The Court concludes that Fort Lewis is a federal enclave. <u>See Willis</u>, 555 F.2d at 726; U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 17. The Court also concludes that federal question jurisdiction in this case is presented on the face of plaintiff's complaint, as the complaint alleges a tort claim that arose on a federal enclave. <u>See Caterpillar, Inc.</u>, 482 U.S. at 392; <u>Durham</u>, 445 F.3d at 1250. Therefore, the Court possesses subject matter jurisdiction over this case, and this case need not be remanded to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. DATED this 20th day of December, 2010.

hard wature

J. Richard Creatura United States Magistrate Judge

ORDER - 3