

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Maria Cardenas v. Ford Motor Company, et al.

No. 2:25-cv-05432-FLA (JCx), United States District Court for the Central District of California (June 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 remanded for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The court questioned whether Ford Motor Company had demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that the amount in controversy exceeded \$75,000 for diversity jurisdiction and directed the parties to respond 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	June 24, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-05432-FLA (JCx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After removal, the district court sua sponte reviewed the Notice of Removal and ordered the parties to show cause why the action should not be remanded for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court independently examines subject matter jurisdiction sua sponte. When the amount in controversy is contested or questioned, the party asserting federal jurisdiction must establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the jurisdictional threshold is satisfied.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- federalism

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Notice of Removal adequately demonstrated that the amount in controversy exceeded \$75,000 for purposes of diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a).
2. Whether the action should be remanded for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. The Notice of Removal did not presently demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the amount in controversy exceeded \$75,000.
2. The court did not yet enter a final remand; instead, it ordered the parties to show cause within fourteen days why the action should not be remanded and invited evidence addressing the facial and factual sufficiency of Defendant's jurisdictional showing.

KEY QUOTATIONS

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

“The parties are ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE, in writing only, within fourteen (14) days from the date of this Order, why this action should not be remanded for lack of subject matter jurisdiction because the amount in controversy does not exceed the jurisdictional threshold.” (at 2)

“As Defendant is the party asserting federal jurisdiction, Defendant’s failure to respond timely and adequately to this Order shall result in remand of the action without further notice.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action was removed to federal court by Ford Motor Company and other defendants. The court concluded that the Notice of Removal did not demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the amount in controversy exceeded the \$75,000 threshold for diversity jurisdiction. The court therefore required the parties, particularly Defendant as the party asserting federal jurisdiction, to submit written responses and supporting evidence.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Defendant removed the action to the Central District of California. The court reviewed the Notice of Removal and found that it did not presently demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the amount in controversy exceeded \$75,000. The court ordered written responses within fourteen days and warned that Defendant's failure to respond timely and adequately would result in remand without further notice.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The parties must submit written responses within fourteen days explaining why the action should not be remanded for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Responses are limited to ten pages. Defendant should submit evidence or judicially noticeable facts addressing the facial and factual sufficiency of its demonstration that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. Defendant's failure to respond timely and adequately will result in remand without further notice.

CASES CITED

- Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am., 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 Cherokee Basin Operating Co. v. Owens, 574 U.S. 81, 88-89 (2014)
- Gaus v. Miles, Inc., 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Leite v. Crane Co., 749 F.3d 1117, 1122 (9th Cir. 2014)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/maria-cardenas-v-ford-motor-company-et-al-95kmujg0>