

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Greg Anderson v. Louis Vuitton North America, Inc.

Anderson v. Louis Vuitton · No. CV 25-2878-JFW(MBKx) · Decided June 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California denied Plaintiff Greg Anderson’s motion to remand, holding that Defendants established complete diversity and an amount in controversy exceeding \$75,000. The court also denied Defendant Louis Vuitton USA Inc.’s motion to compel arbitration and dismiss or stay the action because Plaintiff’s alleged sexual-harassment claim was a nonfrivolous claim potentially covered by the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act. The court did not decide whether a valid arbitration agreement existed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John F. Walter
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	June 5, 2025
DOCKET	CV 25-2878-JFW(MBKx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to remand an employment action removed from Los Angeles County Superior Court on diversity-jurisdiction grounds. Defendant LVUSA moved to compel arbitration and to dismiss or stay the action. The district court decided both motions on the papers and denied both motions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Removal statutes are strictly construed, doubts concerning removal are resolved in favor of remand, and the removing defendant bears the burden of establishing federal jurisdiction. For the EFAA issue, the court applied a nonfrivolous-claim standard and declined to adjudicate the merits or pleading sufficiency of the sexual-harassment claim in the arbitration proceeding.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

subject matter jurisdiction

arbitration

sexual harassment

hostile work environment

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

employment law

arbitration

sexual harassment

employment discrimination

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Defendants established complete diversity of citizenship for purposes of removal.
2. Whether Defendants established by a preponderance of the evidence that the amount in controversy exceeded \$75,000.
3. Whether the alleged sexual-harassment claim constituted a nonfrivolous claim relating to conduct alleged to constitute sexual harassment under the EFAA, thereby precluding enforcement of a predispute arbitration agreement as to the case.
4. Whether the court should decide the validity of the alleged arbitration agreement after determining that the EFAA applied.

HOLDINGS

1. Defendants established complete diversity because LVUSA and LVNA were Delaware corporations with principal places of business in New York, while the undisputed facts and Plaintiff's California residence supported the conclusion that Plaintiff was domiciled and therefore a citizen of California.
2. Defendants established by a preponderance of the evidence that the amount in controversy exceeded \$75,000.
3. A plaintiff need only plead a nonfrivolous claim relating to conduct alleged to constitute sexual harassment to invoke the EFAA; the court should reserve the claim's sufficiency and merits for an appropriate merits proceeding rather than deciding them on a motion to compel arbitration.
4. The court did not need to decide whether the parties entered into a valid arbitration agreement because the EFAA issue was dispositive of the motion to compel arbitration.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The removal statute is strictly construed, and any doubt about the right of removal is resolved in favor of remand.” (Section II.A)

“The view that is more faithful to Congress' language and intent is that a plaintiff need only plead nonfrivolous claims relating to sexual assault or to conduct alleged to constitute sexual harassment, with the sufficiency of those claims to be reserved for proper merits adjudication, be it a motion to dismiss, motion for judgment on the pleadings, motion for summary judgment, or trial.” (Section III.B)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Greg Anderson worked for Louis Vuitton USA as a Team Manager in California from July 2022 until June 2024 and then became Store Director of a Louis Vuitton store in Hawaii. He alleges that Defendants pressured managers to prevent or falsify overtime records and terminated him in November 2024 in retaliation for raising

concerns about those practices. He also alleges that a Regional Vice President made sexually suggestive comments about his appearance, including that he was "too hot for Hawaii."

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action in Los Angeles County Superior Court on February 13, 2025. Defendants removed the case on April 2, 2025, asserting diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(a), 1441, and 1446. The district court denied Plaintiff's motion to remand, concluding that complete diversity and the amount-in-controversy requirement were established. It also denied LVUSA's motion to compel arbitration because the complaint alleged a nonfrivolous sexual-harassment claim covered by the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- N. Cal. Dist. Council of Laborers v. Pittsburg-Des Moines Steel Co., 69 F.3d 1034, 1038 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Gaus v. Miles, Inc., 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Prize Frize, Inc. v. Matrix, Inc., 167 F.3d 1261, 1265 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Duncan v. Stuetzle, 76 F.3d 1480, 1485 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Kanter v. Warner-Lambert Co., 265 F.3d 853, 857 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Lew v. Moss, 797 F.2d 747, 749 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Burch v. Ford Motor Co., 758 F. Supp. 3d 1092 (N.D. Cal. 2024)
- American Express Co. v. Italian Colors Restaurant, 133 S. Ct. 2304, 2308-09 (2013)
- AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion, AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion, 131 S. Ct. 1740, 1745 (2011)
- Wagner v. Stratton Oakmont, Inc., 83 F.3d 1046, 1048 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Chiron Corp. v. Ortho Diagnostic Systems, Inc., 207 F.3d 1126, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Dean Witter Reynolds Inc. v. Byrd, 470 U.S. 213, 218 (1985)
- Moses H. Cone Memorial Hosp. v. Mercury Constr. Corp., 460 U.S. 1, 24-25 (1983)
- Howsam v. Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc., 537 U.S. 79, 84 (2002)
- Momot v. Mastro, 652 F.3d 982, 987 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Halle Van De Hey v. Epam Systems Inc., 2025 WL 829604, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 28, 2025)
- Diaz-Roa v. Hermes L., P.C., 757 F. Supp. 3d 498, 533 (S.D.N.Y. 2024)
- Gill v. US Data Mgmt., LLC, 2024 WL 5402494, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 2, 2024)
- Yost v. Everyrealm, Inc., 657 F. Supp. 3d 563, 585 (S.D.N.Y. 2023)
- Solis v. Prime Comms Retail, LLC, 2025 WL 1255143, at *2-*3 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 7, 2025)