

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Ayona v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc.

Ayona · No. 8:25-cv-00677-JVS-ADS · Decided July 17, 2025

SUMMARY

The Central District of California denied Cynthia Ayona’s motion to remand her consumer warranty action against Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. The court held that removal was timely and that the amount-in-controversy requirement under the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act was satisfied through potential Song-Beverly Act civil penalties and attorneys’ fees. The court also exercised supplemental jurisdiction over Ayona’s related state-law claims and vacated the hearing.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	James V. Selna
JURISDICTION	U.S. District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	July 17, 2025
DOCKET	8:25-cv-00677-JVS-ADS
DISPOSITION	remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to remand a removed civil action to state court, arguing that removal was untimely, the amount-in-controversy requirement for the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act was not satisfied, and the Court should decline supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The removing defendant bears the burden of establishing that removal is proper, and doubts concerning removability are resolved in favor of remand. The amount in controversy for a Magnuson-Moss claim is determined from the pleadings unless it appears to a legal certainty that the plaintiff cannot recover the amount claimed.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- consumer protection
- damages
- attorney fees

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

consumer protection

consumer warranty law

federal jurisdiction

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Toyota timely removed the action within the applicable thirty-day removal period.
2. Whether the amount in controversy exceeded the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act's \$50,000 jurisdictional threshold.
3. Whether the court should decline supplemental jurisdiction over Ayona's related state-law claims.
4. Whether Ayona was entitled to attorney fees under 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c) based on the removal.

HOLDINGS

1. Toyota's removal was timely because the last day of the thirty-day period is included when a time period is stated in days, and the April 3, 2025 notice of removal fell within the applicable period.
2. The action satisfied the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act's \$50,000 amount-in-controversy requirement.
3. The court exercised supplemental jurisdiction over Ayona's related state-law claims.
4. Ayona was not entitled to attorney fees under 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“This strong ‘presumption against removal jurisdiction means that ‘the defendant always has the burden of establishing that removal is proper.’” (II)

“The Court finds Romo instructive and opts to apply the civil penalties under the Song-Beverly Act towards the MMWA amount in controversy.” (III.B)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Ayona leased and later purchased a 2019 Toyota Mirai. She alleged that the vehicle contained defects Toyota failed to disclose, repair, or otherwise remedy. Her complaint sought restitution of \$21,252.37, a civil penalty of twice actual damages, attorney fees, and damages under the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, the Song-Beverly Act, and other state-law theories.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Ayona filed suit in Orange County Superior Court concerning alleged defects in a 2019 Toyota Mirai and asserted claims under the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act, the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, and various California causes of action. Toyota removed the action on April 3, 2025. Ayona moved to remand on June 4, 2025; Toyota opposed and Ayona replied. The district court denied the motion to remand, retained supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims, denied attorney fees, and vacated the hearing.

DISPOSITION

remanded

CASES CITED

- City of Chicago v. Int'l Coll. of Surgeons, 522 U.S. 156, 163 (1997)
- Moore-Thomas v. Alaska Airlines, Inc., 553 F.3d 1241, 1244 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Gaus v. Miles, Inc., 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Kelly v. Fleetwood Enters., Inc., 377 F.3d 1034, 1037 (9th Cir. 2004)
- St. Paul Mercury Indem. Co. v. Red Cab Co., 303 U.S. 283, 289 (1938)
- Shoner v. Carrier Corp., 30 F.4th 1144, 1148 (9th Cir. 2022)
- Fahed Ismat Zawaideh v. BMW of N. Am., LLC, No. 17-CV-2151 W (KSC), 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 64723, at *7 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 17, 2018)
- Romo, 397 F. Supp. 2d 1237, 1240-41 (C.D. Cal. 2005)
- Madrano v. City of Los Angeles, 973 F.2d 1499, 1506 (9th Cir. 1992)
- United Mine Workers of America v. Gibbs, 383 U.S. 715, 725 (1966)
- Martin v. Franklin Capital Corp., 546 U.S. 132, 141 (2005)