

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Mariana Crescioni v. UMG Recordings, Inc.

Crescioni · No. 2:25-cv-05756-FLA (SSCx) · Decided July 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered the parties to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The court questioned whether the Complaint plausibly established that the amount in controversy exceeded \$75,000 under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) and directed the parties to submit written responses within fourteen days.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Fernando L. Aenlle-Rocha
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	July 24, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-05756-FLA (SSCx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court sua sponte reviewed the complaint for subject matter jurisdiction in a diversity action and issued an order requiring the parties to show cause why the action should not be dismissed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court independently examines subject matter jurisdiction sua sponte. When jurisdictional allegations are challenged or questioned, the party asserting jurisdiction must establish the amount in controversy by a preponderance of the evidence.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order to show cause, with no published reporter citation.

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Complaint adequately establishes subject matter jurisdiction under the diversity statute, including whether the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.
2. Whether the parties must submit evidence concerning the jurisdictional amount in response to the court's sua sponte jurisdictional inquiry.
3. Whether dismissal is required if the court determines that subject matter jurisdiction is lacking or if Plaintiff fails to respond adequately to the order to show cause.

HOLDINGS

1. A federal court must examine its subject matter jurisdiction sua sponte before proceeding to the merits, and federal jurisdiction is presumed absent unless it affirmatively appears from the record.
2. A complaint invoking diversity jurisdiction must plausibly allege that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs; because the Complaint did not do so sufficiently, the court required further jurisdictional submissions.
3. If the court determines at any time that it lacks subject matter jurisdiction, it must dismiss the action; Plaintiff's failure to respond timely and adequately to the order to show cause will result in dismissal without further notice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Federal courts are courts of “limited jurisdiction,” possessing only “power authorized by the Constitution and statute[.]”” (at 1)

“A complaint filed in federal court must contain “a plausible allegation that the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional threshold.”” (at 1)

“Responses shall be limited to ten (10) pages in length.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Mariana Crescioni filed a complaint against UMG Recordings, Inc. in federal court based on alleged diversity jurisdiction. The court determined that the Complaint did not state sufficient facts to establish that the amount in controversy exceeded the \$75,000 jurisdictional threshold. The court therefore sought additional evidence or judicially noticeable facts before deciding whether diversity jurisdiction exists.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an action against UMG Recordings, Inc. invoking federal diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). After reviewing the Complaint, the district court found that it could not determine whether the amount in controversy exceeded \$75,000 and ordered the parties to submit written responses, evidence, and judicially noticeable facts within fourteen days. The order warned that Plaintiff's failure to respond timely and adequately would result in dismissal without further notice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Insurance Co. of America, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994)
- DaimlerChrysler Corp. v. Cuno, 547 U.S. 332, 342 n. 3 (2006)
- Ruhrgas AG v. Marathon Oil Co., 526 U.S. 574, 583 (1999)
- Dart v. Cherokee Basin Operating Co. v. Owens, 574 U.S. 81, 89 (2014)
- Dart v. Cherokee Basin Operating Co. v. Owens, 574 U.S. 81, 88-89 (2014)
- Verb Technology Co. v. Baker & Hostetler LLP, Case No. 2:21-cv-06500-ODW (MAAx), 2021 WL 4125207, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2021)
- Leite v. Crane Co., 749 F.3d 1117, 1122 (9th Cir. 2014)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2025/mariana-crescioni-v-umg-recordings-inc-6pynwd5j>