

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

De La Rosa v. Centennial Real Estate Management, LLC

No. 25-cv-02396-NC (N.D. Cal. Mar. 12, 2025) · No. 25-cv-02396-NC · Decided March 12, 2025

OPINION

De La Rosa v. Centennial Real Estate Management, LLC

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 10 GLORIA DE LA ROSA, Case No. 25-cv-02396-NC 11 Plaintiff, ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE WHY

12 CASE SHOULD NOT BE

v. REMANDED TO STATE COURT

13 FOR LACK OF SUBJECT

CENTENNIAL REAL ESTATE MATTER JURISDICTION

14 MANAGEMENT, LLC, et al., Re: ECF 1 15 Defendants. 16 17 This Court orders Defendant
Centennial Real Estate Management, LLC (hereinafter 18 Centennial) to show cause why this
case should not be remanded back to state court for 19 lack of subject matter jurisdiction. 20
Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. 21 Co. of Am.*,
511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994). District courts have subject matter jurisdiction 22 through federal
question or diversity jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332. Diversity 23 jurisdiction requires
complete diversity of citizenship and an amount in controversy greater 24 than \$75,000. 28 U.S.C.
§ 1332(a). The removing party has the burden of establishing 25 that removal is proper. *Lindley
Contours LLC v. AAAB Fitness Holdings, Inc.*, 414 F. 26 App’x 62, 64 (9th Cir. 2011). 27 Here,
Centennial alleges that this Court has diversity jurisdiction because Plaintiff is 1 || Defendant
Windsor Fashions Holdings LLC is a Delaware limited liability company, and 2 || Defendant
Northridge Mall is not listed in the California Secretary of State website. ECF 3 || 1995, 7-8.
These allegations are deficient for two reasons. 4 First, Centennial failed to allege the citizenship
of the owners/members of 5 || Centennial and Windsor, which are both LLCs. “[F]or the purposes
of diversity □□□ an 6 || LLC is a citizen of every state of which its owners/members are citizens.”
Johnson v. 7 Columbia Props. Anchorage, LP, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006). Second,
Centennial 8 || failed to properly allege Northridge Mall’s citizenship when it merely alleged that 9
|| Northridge Mall was not listed on the California Secretary of State website. See *Kanter v. 10 ||
Warner-Lambert Co.*, 265 F.3d 853, 857 (9th Cir. 2001) (finding that a party seeking to 11 ||

invoke diversity jurisdiction should be able to allege affirmatively the actual citizenship of 12 || the relevant parties). Without information on the citizenship of Centennial and Windsor's 13 || owners/members or the citizenship of Northridge Mall, this Court cannot assess whether 14 || complete diversity exists. 15 Accordingly, Defendant Centennial must show cause in writing by March 25, 2025, 16 || why this case should not be remanded back to state court for lack of subject matter 5 17 || jurisdiction. 1g Zz 19 IT IS SO ORDERED. 20 21 || Dated: March 12, 2025 h-=

NATHANAEL M. COUSINS

22 United States Magistrate Judge 23 24 25 26 27 28