

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Ricardo Estrada Castillo v. Varinder Singh, et al.

Castillo v. Singh · No. CV 25-1511 FMO (AJRx) · Decided January 22, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California remanded the action to the Los Angeles County Superior Court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The court held that the removing defendant failed to establish complete diversity because it did not identify the members of Horizon Royal Carrier Transport, LLC or their citizenships, and denied pending motions as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Fernando M. Olguin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	January 22, 2026
DOCKET	CV 25-1511 FMO (AJRx)
DISPOSITION	remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants removed a personal-injury action from California state court under 28 U.S.C. § 1441. After ordering the parties to show cause regarding the citizenship of an LLC defendant, the district court remanded the action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The removing defendant bears the burden of establishing that removal is proper. Any doubt concerning federal subject matter jurisdiction must be resolved in favor of remand, and the court must remand sua sponte when it appears before final judgment that subject matter jurisdiction is lacking.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential unpublished district-court order
PARTIES	Ricardo Estrada Castillo v. Varinder Singh, Horizon Royal Carrier Transport, LLC, other defendants

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- federalism

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

removal jurisdiction

diversity jurisdiction

federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the removing defendants established federal diversity subject matter jurisdiction.
2. Whether an LLC's state of organization and principal place of business establish its citizenship for diversity purposes.
3. Whether the action had to be remanded when the LLC failed to identify its members and their citizenship.

HOLDINGS

1. The removing defendants failed to establish complete diversity because Horizon Royal Carrier Transport, LLC did not identify its members or the citizenship of each member.
2. For diversity-jurisdiction purposes, an LLC's state of organization and principal place of business are irrelevant; the LLC has the citizenship of each of its members.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The strong presumption against removal jurisdiction means that the defendant always has the burden of establishing that removal is proper.” (Order at 1)

“Federal jurisdiction must be rejected if there is any doubt as to the right of removal in the first instance.” (Order at 1)

“An LLC’s principal place of business [or] state of organization is irrelevant” (Order at 2)

“a citizen of every state of which its owners/members are citizens.” (Order at 2)

“There is no such thing as ‘a [state name] limited partnership’ for purposes of . . . diversity jurisdiction. There are only partners, each of which has one or more citizenships.” (Order at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The defendants removed the action on the asserted basis of federal diversity jurisdiction. In response to the court's jurisdictional order to show cause, Horizon Royal Carrier Transport, LLC stated only that it was registered in Washington and had its principal place of business there. The LLC did not identify its members or the citizenship of each member, leaving the court unable to determine whether complete diversity existed.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was removed to the Central District of California on February 21, 2025. The court issued an order to show cause concerning the citizenship of Horizon Royal Carrier Transport, LLC. After reviewing the parties' jurisdiction memoranda, the court concluded that the removing defendants had not established complete diversity and remanded the action to the Los Angeles County Superior Court; all pending motions were denied as moot.

DISPOSITION

remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The action was remanded to the Los Angeles County Superior Court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c). The Clerk was directed to send a certified copy of the order to the state court. All pending motions were denied as moot.

CASES CITED

- Gaus v. Miles, Inc., 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992) (per curiam)
- Abrego Abrego v. The Dow Chem. Co., 443 F.3d 676, 684 (9th Cir. 2006) (per curiam)
- Kelton Arms Condo. Owners Ass'n, Inc. v. Homestead Ins. Co., 346 F.3d 1190, 1192 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Washington v. United Parcel Serv., Inc., 2009 WL 1519894, at *1 (C.D. Cal. 2009)
- Caterpillar Inc. v. Lewis, 519 U.S. 61, 68, 117 S. Ct. 467, 472 (1996)
- Buschman v. Anesthesia Bus. Consultants LLC, 42 F. Supp. 3d 1244, 1248 (N.D. Cal. 2014)
- Tele Munchen Fernseh GMBH & Co Produktionsgesellschaft v. Alliance Atlantis Int'l Distrib., LLC, 2013 WL 6055328, at *4 (C.D. Cal. 2013)
- Johnson v. Columbia Props. Anchorage, LP, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Grupo Dataflux v. Atlas Global Grp., L.P., 541 U.S. 567, 569, 124 S. Ct. 1920, 1923 (2004)
- Hart v. Terminex Int'l, 336 F.3d 541, 544 (7th Cir. 2003)
- Lindley Contours, LLC v. AABB Fitness Holdings, Inc., 414 F. App'x 62, 65 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Amescua v. Peacock TV LLC, 2024 WL 39192, at *3 (C.D. Cal. 2024)