

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Maguire Properties 755 S Fig LLC v. Donovan Grant

Maguire Properties · No. 2:25-cv-06308-CAS-RAOx · Decided August 1, 2025

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL MINUTES — GENERAL JS-6 Case No. 2:25-cv-06308-CAS-RAOx Date August 1, 2025 Title Maguire Properties 755 S Fig LLC v. Donovan Grant Present: The Honorable CHRISTINA A. SNYDER Catherine Jeang Not Present N/A Deputy Clerk Court Reporter / Recorder Tape No. Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs: Attorneys Present for Defendants: Not Present Not Present Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) - ORDER TO REMAND On February 24, 2025, plaintiff Maguire Properties 755 S Fig LLC (“plaintiff”) filed this unlawful detainer action against defendant Donovan Grant (“defendant”) in Los Angeles County Superior Court.

Dkt. 1 at 10. Defendant removed the case to this Court on July 10, 2025. Id. at 1. Defendant concurrently filed a request to proceed in forma pauperis. Dkt. 2. Defendant asserts that this Court has jurisdiction on the basis of a federal question. Dkt. | at 3 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1441). It appears that this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over this action.

The law is clear that “[u]nlawful detainer actions are strictly within the province of state court.” Federal Nat’l Mort. Assoc. v. Suarez, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 82300, *6 (E.D. Cal. Jul. 27, 2011); Deutsche Bank Nat’l Trust Co. v. Leonardo, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 83854, *2 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2011) (“[T]he complaint only asserts a claim for unlawful detainer, a cause of action that is purely a matter of state law.”).

Here, the only claim asserted by plaintiff is for unlawful detainer against defendant. See dkt. 1 at 10. The Court therefore lacks subject matter jurisdiction and must remand. Suarez, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 82300 at *6.

On July 17, 2025, the Court ordered defendant to show cause, in writing, no later than July 31, 2025, why this case should not be remanded to Los Angeles County Superior Court. Dkt. 8. Defendant has failed to respond to the order to show cause.

Accordingly, the Court REMANDS this case to Los Angeles County Superior Court. IT IS SO ORDERED. 00: 00 Initials of Preparer CMI