

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Monteverde & Associates PC v. Harpoon Therapeutics, Inc.

Monteverde · No. 24-cv-08935-AMO · Decided June 2, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California granted Monteverde & Associates P.C.’s motion to remand the case to San Mateo Superior Court. The court held that Harpoon Therapeutics had not established federal jurisdiction under the substantial-federal-question doctrine because the federal issues raised by the state-law claims were fact-bound and situation-specific.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Araceli Martinez-Olguin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	June 2, 2025
DOCKET	24-cv-08935-AMO
DISPOSITION	remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to remand an action removed from San Mateo Superior Court, arguing that federal subject matter jurisdiction was absent.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The removing defendant bears the burden of establishing by a preponderance of the evidence that removal was proper.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- federalism
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal jurisdiction
- securities litigation
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the plaintiff's state-law claims necessarily raised a substantial federal issue sufficient to support federal-question jurisdiction under the Grable doctrine.
2. Whether the federal court had subject matter jurisdiction over the removed action.

HOLDINGS

1. The state-law claims did not raise a substantial federal issue because the federal questions were fact-bound and situation-specific, concerning whether information should have been disclosed, whether the original proxy statement was misleading, and whether supplemental disclosures were material.
2. Because the removing defendant failed to establish federal subject matter jurisdiction, the case had to be remanded to state court.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A removing defendant bears the burden of establishing by a preponderance of the evidence that removal was proper.” (at 1)

“These questions are “fact-bound and situation-specific” because their resolution will necessarily involve examination of the particular disclosures and circumstances at issue in this case.” (at 1-2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The case involved state-law claims concerning alleged omissions and misleading disclosures in an original proxy statement and the materiality of supplemental disclosures. The federal questions implicated by those claims required examination of the particular disclosures and circumstances of the case.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was removed to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Plaintiff moved to remand to San Mateo Superior Court, and the district court granted the motion, vacated all pending federal deadlines and hearings, and directed the Clerk to transmit the file to state court.

DISPOSITION

remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The Clerk of Court was directed to transmit the file back to the state court. All pending deadlines and hearings scheduled before the federal court were vacated.

CASES CITED

- Geographic Expeditions, Inc. v. Estate of Lhotka ex rel. Lhotka, 599 F.3d 1102, 1106-07 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Grable & Sons Metal Prods., Inc. v. Darue Eng'g & Mfg., 545 U.S. 308 (2005)
- Cnty. of San Mateo v. Chevron Corp., 32 F.4th 733, 747 (9th Cir. 2022)

