

**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

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. AABB 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. 3d 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