

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

**Arthur Reid Stephenson, et al. v. Jaguar Land Rover North America,
LLC, et al.**

No. 25-cv-07732-NC, United States District Court for the Northern District of California (September 12, 2025)

OPINION

Stephenson v. Jaguar Land Rover North America, LLC

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 10 ARTHUR REID STEPHENSON, et al., Case No. 25-cv-07732-NC 11 Plaintiffs, ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE

12 WHY CASE SHOULD NOT BE

v. REMANDED TO STATE

13 COURT FOR LACK OF

JAGUAR LAND ROVER NORTH SUBJECT MATTER

14 AMERICA, LLC, et al., JURISDICTION 15 Defendants. Re: ECF 1 16 17 Defendant Jaguar
Land Rover North America (JLRNA) removed this case to this 18 Court from Santa Clara County
Superior Court on September 11, 2025. ECF 1. This 19 Order requires JLRNA to “show cause” by
filing a written response by September 26, 20 2025, explaining why this case should not be
remanded back to state court for lack of 21 subject matter jurisdiction. 22 Federal courts are courts
of limited jurisdiction. *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994).
District courts have subject matter jurisdiction 24 through federal question or diversity
jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332. Diversity 25 jurisdiction requires complete diversity of
citizenship and an amount in controversy greater 26 than \$75,000. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). 27
JLRNA claims that there is diversity of citizenship because Plaintiffs reside in 1 || Defendant
Jaguar Land Rover San Jose was not served. ECF 1 §[] 20-22. But the 2 || diversity jurisdiction
statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1332, speaks of citizenship, not residency. “The 3 || natural person’s state
citizenship is then determined by her state of domicile, not her state 4 of residence. A person’s
domicile is her permanent home, where she resides with the 5 || intention to remain or to which
she intends to return... A person residing in a given state 6 is not necessarily domiciled there, and
thus is not necessarily a citizen of that state.” 7 || *Kanter v. Warner-Lambert Co.*, 265 F.3d 853,
857 (9th Cir. 2001) (citations omitted). 8 Here, JLRNA failed to allege where Plaintiffs are
domiciled, and therefore this Court 9 || cannot assess whether complete diversity exists. 10 The

Court finds that JURNA provided sufficient information to establish that the 11 |} amount in controversy threshold is satisfied. ECF 1 4] 16. 12 In conclusion, JERNA has not established that federal subject matter jurisdiction is 13 || satisfied because it did not provide sufficient facts and sufficiently allege Plaintiffs' state 14 || citizenship. Accordingly, JURNA must show cause in writing by September 26, 2025, 15 || why this case should not be remanded back to state court for lack of subject matter 16 |} jurisdiction. Plaintiffs may respond by October 3, 2025. 17 IT IS SO ORDERED. 19 || Dated: September 12, 2025

NATHANAEL M. COUSINS

20 United States Magistrate Judge 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28