

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Angel Bazan v. Sedgwick Claims Management Services Inc. et al.

Bazan · No. 2:25-cv-02738-AH-(Ex) · Decided May 27, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California denied Plaintiff Angel Bazan’s motion to remand an employment-discrimination action against Sedgwick Claims Management Services, Inc. The court held that Sedgwick established complete diversity because it was incorporated in Illinois and its principal place of business, or nerve center, was in Memphis, Tennessee.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Anne Hwang
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	May 27, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02738-AH-(Ex)
DISPOSITION	denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to remand an employment-discrimination action removed from the Los Angeles County Superior Court on the basis of diversity jurisdiction. The district court denied the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The removing defendant bears the burden of establishing federal subject-matter jurisdiction. For diversity jurisdiction, complete diversity must exist and the amount in controversy must exceed \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs. The court evaluated the evidentiary submissions supporting removal.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; limited persuasive value.
PARTIES	Angel Bazan v. Sedgwick Claims Management Services, Inc.

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court had diversity subject-matter jurisdiction over the removed action.
2. Whether Sedgwick established that its principal place of business was in Tennessee, rather than California, for purposes of complete diversity.
3. Whether the court could consider Sedgwick's declaration and California Secretary of State Statement of Information over Bazan's hearsay, authentication, foundation, and speculation objections.

HOLDINGS

1. The court had diversity subject-matter jurisdiction because Bazan was a California resident, Sedgwick was incorporated in Illinois and had its principal place of business in Tennessee, and the parties did not dispute that the amount in controversy exceeded \$75,000.
2. Sedgwick's principal place of business was in Memphis, Tennessee.
3. The court overruled Bazan's objections to the Statement of Information and the Jenkins Declaration and considered both in deciding the remand motion.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“where [Defendant’s]...officers direct, control, and coordinate the corporation’s activities [and]...where [Defendant] maintains its headquarters.” (559 U.S. at 93)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Bazan, a California resident, sued Sedgwick after alleging that his employment with Walmart was terminated because of absences related to his bipolar disorder and that Sedgwick rejected paperwork supporting medical leave. Sedgwick was alleged to be incorporated in Illinois and to serve as Walmart's third-party administrator for disability and workers' compensation claims. Sedgwick submitted a declaration and a California Secretary of State Statement of Information showing that its executive functions, officers, directors, principal address, and corporate headquarters were in Memphis, Tennessee.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Bazan filed an eight-count complaint in Los Angeles County Superior Court on March 28, 2025. Sedgwick removed the action to the Central District of California the same day, asserting diversity jurisdiction. Bazan moved to remand, and the court denied the motion after overruling evidentiary objections to declarations and supporting corporate records.

DISPOSITION

denied

CASES CITED

- Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am., 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994)
- Bengtsson v. Caris MPI, Inc., 2022 WL 2764367, at *2, *3-*4 (C.D. Cal. July 13, 2022)
- Geographic Expeditions, Inc. v. Estate of Lhotka, 599 F.3d 1102, 1106-07 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Caterpillar Inc. v. Lewis, 519 U.S. 61, 68 (1996)
- Malamed v. First W. Cap. Mgmt. Co., 2017 WL 1393023, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 24, 2017)
- Hertz Corp. v. Friend, 559 U.S. 77, 92-93 (2010)
- Peich v. Flatiron W., Inc., 2016 WL 6634851, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 9, 2016)
- Modiano v. BMW of N. Am. LLC, 2021 WL 973566, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 16, 2021)
- JL Beverage Co., LLC v. Jim Beam Brands Co., 828 F.3d 1098, 1110 (9th Cir. 2016)
- FT Travel--New York, LLC v. Your Travel Ctr., Inc., 112 F. Supp. 3d 1063, 1079 (C.D. Cal. 2015)
- L'Garde, Inc. v. Raytheon Space & Airborne Sys., 805 F. Supp. 2d 932, 940 (C.D. Cal. 2011)