

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

Leanne and Scott Seeley v. Blue Raven Solar LLC, et al.

No. C25-6032 BHS (W.D. Wash. Jan. 8, 2026) · No. C25-6032 BHS · Decided January 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The court denied the plaintiffs’ motion to remand an action involving alleged defects in solar panels, state breach-of-contract claims, and federal Truth in Lending Act claims. The court held that removal was proper based on federal-question jurisdiction and that the defendants had also demonstrated diversity jurisdiction and an amount in controversy exceeding \$75,000.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Benjamin H. Settle
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
DECIDED	January 8, 2026
DOCKET	C25-6032 BHS
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs moved to remand a removed civil action to Washington state court after filing an amended complaint that deleted their federal claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a motion to remand, the party asserting federal jurisdiction bears the burden of establishing that removal was proper by a preponderance of the evidence; removal statutes are strictly construed against removal jurisdiction, and doubts are resolved against removal.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reporter citation or stated precedential designation.

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- truth in lending
- breach of contract

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- contracts
- consumer protection

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the case should be remanded after plaintiffs amended the complaint to delete their federal claims.
2. Whether defendants established diversity jurisdiction based on the citizenship of the parties and an amount in controversy exceeding \$75,000.
3. Whether plaintiffs were entitled to fees under 28 U.S.C. § 1447 for seeking remand.

HOLDINGS

1. Remand was not warranted because the initial removal was proper based on the federal claims, and defendants also demonstrated diversity jurisdiction over the action.
2. Defendants established diversity jurisdiction because the parties were citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeded the \$75,000 jurisdictional threshold.
3. Plaintiffs were not entitled to fees under 28 U.S.C. § 1447 because the removal was proper.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The strong presumption against removal jurisdiction means that the defendant always has the burden of establishing removal is proper.” (at 1)

“Even against this standard, defendants have demonstrated that the parties are diverse and the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional threshold. The motion to remand is DENIED.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs purchased, financed, and arranged for the installation of Blue Raven solar panels on their home, which they alleged were defective. They sought more than \$200,000 in damages and initially asserted state breach-of-contract and federal Truth in Lending Act claims. Defendants alleged that plaintiffs were Washington citizens, that the defendants were citizens of other states, and that the amount in controversy exceeded \$75,000.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed suit in Pierce County Superior Court asserting state breach-of-contract and federal Truth in Lending Act claims arising from the purchase, financing, and installation of allegedly defective solar panels. Defendants removed the case based on federal-question and diversity jurisdiction. Plaintiffs then amended the complaint to delete the federal claims and moved to remand, arguing that supplemental jurisdiction should be declined and that diversity jurisdiction had not been adequately established. The district court denied the motion to remand and denied plaintiffs' request for fees under 28 U.S.C. § 1447.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Lindley Contours, LLC v. AABF Fitness Holdings, Inc., 414 F. App'x 62, 64 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Conrad Associates v. Hartford Accident & Indemnity Co., 994 F. Supp. 1196, 1198-99 (N.D. Cal.)
- Gaus v. Miles, 980 F.2d 564, 566-67 (9th Cir.)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA 7 LEANNE and SCOTT SEELEY, CASE NO. C25-6032 BHS 8 Plaintiffs, ORDER
9 v. 10 BLUE RAVEN SOLAR LLC, et al., 11 Defendants. 12 13 THIS MATTER is before the
Court on pro se plaintiffs Scott and Leanne Seeley's 14 motion to remand, Dkt. 7.

In October 2025, Seeley¹ sued defendants Blue Raven Solar, 15 Complete Solar, and Sunstrong Management in Pierce County Superior Court. She 16 asserted state breach of contract and federal Truth in Lending Act claims, based on 17 purchase, financing, and installation of allegedly defective Blue Raven solar panels on 18 her home. She sought more than \$200,000 in damages.

Dkt. 1-1. 19 20 21 22 1 The Court uses the singular, feminine "Seeley" for clarity and ease of reference. 1 In November, Defendants removed the case based on federal question and 2 diversity jurisdiction, asserting that Seeley was a Washington citizen and all defendants 3 were citizens of other states. Dkt. 1. 4 Seeley filed an amended complaint the next day, deleting her federal claims.

Dkt. 5 6. She also filed a motion to remand based on the amended complaint, asserting that the 6 Court should decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over her remaining state law 7 claims. Dkt. 7 at 2 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3)). She argues that defendants did not 8 establish the Court's diversity jurisdiction because the notice of removal did not identify 9 the citizenship of the LLCs or the citizenship of the LLC's members.

Id. at 3 (citing 10 Lindley Contours, LLC v. AABF Fitness Holdings, Inc., 414 F. App'x 62, 64 (9th Cir. 11 2011)). 12 Defendants' response is succinct and accurate: 13 The Notice of Removal did not incorrectly plead the LLCs like corporations for diversity purposes. Instead, it pled that the sole member of 14 Blue Raven Solar, LLC is a citizen of Delaware and California, and that all members of SunStrong Management, LLC are citizens of Delaware, 15 California, and Maryland.

Complete Solar, a corporation, is a citizen of Delaware and Utah. Because Plaintiffs are citizens of Washington, this 16 Court has diversity jurisdiction. 17 Dkt. 13 at 2. They contend that the parties are of diverse citizenship and that 18 Seeley's amended complaint continues to place more than the \$75,000 19 jurisdictional threshold at issue. Id. Defendants argue that the Court has subject 20 matter jurisdiction over the case and that the motion to remand should be denied.

21 The Court agrees. The initial removal was proper based on Seeley's federal 22 claims, and her request for § 1447 fees on remand is DENIED. 1 The party asserting federal jurisdiction has the

burden of proof on a motion to 2 remand to state court. *Conrad Associates v. Hartford Accident & Indemnity Co.*, 994 F. 3 Supp. 1196, 1198 (N.D. Cal. 1998).

The removal statute is strictly construed against 4 removal jurisdiction. *Id.* The strong presumption against removal jurisdiction means that 5 the defendant always has the burden of establishing removal is proper. *Id.* It 6 is obligated to do so by a preponderance of the evidence. *Id.* at 1199; see 7 also *Gaus v. Miles*, 980 F.2d 564, 567 (9th Cir. 1992). Federal jurisdiction must be 8 rejected if there is any doubt as to the right of removal in the first instance.

Gaus, 980 9 F.2d at 566. 10 Even against this standard, defendants have demonstrated that the parties are 11 diverse and the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional threshold. The motion to 12 remand is DENIED. 13 IT IS SO ORDERED. 14 Dated this 8th day of January, 2026. A 15 16 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE 17 United States District Judge 18 19 20 21 22