

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

**Enright v. Centene Management Company, LLC d/b/a Health Net
Federal Services, LLC**

No. 25cv0796-LL-MSB (S.D. Cal. June 27, 2025) · No. 25cv0796-LL-MSB · Decided June 27, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California denied Paul C. Enright’s motion to remand his employment-law action against Centene Management Company, LLC to state court. The court held that diversity jurisdiction existed because the amount in controversy exceeded \$75,000 and the parties were completely diverse, and it denied the related motion to stay as moot.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 PAUL C. ENRIGHT, Case No.: 25cv0796-LL-MSB 12 Plaintiff, ORDER
DENYING MOTION TO 13 v. REMAND CASE TO STATE COURT AND DENYING AS
MOOT MOTION 14 CENTENE MANAGEMENT TO STAY COMPANY, LLC d/b/a HEALTH
NET 15 FEDERAL SERVICES, LLC, [ECF Nos. 6, 7] 16 Defendant. 17 18 Plaintiff Paul C.
Enright, acting pro se, sued Defendant Centene Management 19 Company, LLC d/b/a Health Net
Federal Services, LLC for allegedly violating California 20 employment laws.

ECF No. 1-2 (“Compl.”). Defendant timely removed the case from San 21 Diego Superior Court
to this Court under diversity jurisdiction. ECF No. 1. Plaintiff moved 22 to remand the case to
state court and to stay it in the interim. ECF Nos. 6, 7. These matters 23 are fully briefed, and the
Court deems them suitable for determination on the papers and 24 without oral argument pursuant
to Civil Local Rule 7.1.

For the reasons below, the Court 25 DENIES Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand and DENIES AS
MOOT his Motion to Stay. 26 I. LEGAL STANDARD 27 If a district court has “original
jurisdiction” over a civil action, a defendant may 28 remove it from state to federal court. 28
U.S.C. § 1441(a). A form of original jurisdiction, 1 often called diversity jurisdiction, exists when
(1) the “matter in controversy” exceeds 2 “\$75,000” and (2) the civil action is between “citizens
of different States.” 28 U.S.C. 3 § 1332(a)(1).

If a federal court lacks the proper jurisdiction after removal, “the case shall 4 be remanded” to
state court. 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c). Because there is a “strong presumption” 5 against removal, “the
defendant always has the burden of establishing removal is proper.” 6 Gaus v. Miles, Inc., 980

F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992). 7 II. DISCUSSION 8 A. Matter in Controversy 9 Plaintiff, a former healthcare analyst, alleges that Defendant unlawfully fired him in 10 December 2021.

See Compl. Plaintiff seeks compensatory, general, and punitive damages. 11 See, e.g., id. ¶ 145 (“Mr. Enright has been damaged in that he was wrongfully and tortiously 12 deprived of future wages, bonuses, benefits, and other compensation to which he was and 13 remains entitled.”).

Although Plaintiff does not quantify his damages, the only reasonable 14 reading of the complaint is that his claims for over three years of lost wages, bonuses, etc. 15 exceeds \$75,000, especially when coupled with his other requests. See *Singer v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 116 F.3d 373, 377 (9th Cir. 1997) (“The district court may consider 17 whether it is ‘facially apparent’ from the complaint that the jurisdictional amount is in 18 controversy.”).

Even if it were not facially apparent, Defendant’s petition also reveals that 19 the matter in controversy exceeds the requisite \$75,000. See id. (noting that the court may 20 “consider facts in the removal petition” when assessing “the amount in controversy”); 21 ECF No. 1 ¶ 24 (calculating Plaintiff’s salary as “\$114,685.87 per year”). 22 B. Citizens of Different States 23 Complete “diversity jurisdiction does not exist unless each defendant is a citizen of 24 a different State from each plaintiff.” *Owen Equip. & Erection Co. v. Kroger*, 437 U.S. 25 365, 373 (1978).

A person is a “citizen” or “domiciled” where he or she resides and intends 26 to stay. *Lew v. Moss*, 797 F.2d 747, 749–50 (9th Cir. 1986). A corporation, meanwhile, has 27 two citizenships: the state where it was “incorporated” and the state where it has its 28 “principal place of business.” *Hertz Corp. v. Friend*, 559 U.S. 77, 88 (2010). An “LLC is | citizen of every state of which its owners/members are citizens.” *Johnson v. Columbia 2 || Properties Anchorage, LP*, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir.

2006). Since the “Johnson court 3 || analyzed the state citizenship of each component member of the defendant’s entity,” courts 4 sitting in alleged diversity, like here, must “evaluate whether a defendant has discharged 5 burden for removal by looking at the layers of citizenship of each LLC member.” 6 || *Traeger Grills E., LLC v. Traeger Pellet Grills, LLC*, No. 11-cv-0536-AC, 2011 WL 7 115439330, at *3 (D.

Or. Nov. 9, 2011). 8 Here, the parties are completely diverse. Plaintiff resides in California and does not 9 || allege any intention to move. See generally Compl. Plaintiff’s domicile is thus California. 10 || Next, looking at the layers of Defendant’s LLC members, Centene Management Company 11 || LLC’s sole member is Centene Corporation, incorporated in Delaware with a principal 12 place of business in Missouri; and Health Net Federal Services, LLC’s sole member is 13 || Health Net, LCC, whose sole member is Centene Corporation, the Delaware and Missouri 14 || citizen.

ECF No. 4. Because the matter in controversy exceeds \$75,000 and the parties are 15 || citizens of different states, the Court has original diversity jurisdiction over this case.! 16 || TT. CONCLUSION 17 Accordingly, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's Motion to Remand Case to State Court 18 DENIES AS MOOT his Motion to Stay. 19 IT IS SO ORDERED. 20 || Dated: June 27, 2025 NO 21 DE | 22 Honorable Linda Lopez 33 United States District Judge 24 26 Contrary to Plaintiff's concern, removal did not discount his ability to recover under state 27 || law.

See *Mason & Dixon Intermodal, Inc. v. Lapmaster Int'l LLC*, 632 F.3d 1056, 1060 28 (9th Cir. 201 1) (“When a district court sits in diversity, or hears state law claims based on supplemental jurisdiction, the court applies state substantive law to the state law claims.”).