

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

---

OPINION

Enright v. Centene Management Company, LLC

PER CURIAM.

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 16 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.””).