| | Case 2:24-cv-02748-WBS-CSK Document | 6 Filed 12/12/24 Page 1 of 2 |
|----|---|--|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 9 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 10 | 00000 | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | BARBARA RATCLIFFE, | No. 2:24-cv-02748 WBS CSK |
| 13 | Plaintiff, | |
| 14 | V. | ORDER RE: DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS ¹ |
| 15 | YOCHA DEHE WINTUN NATION d/b/a CACHE CREEK CASINO RESORT, | 10 DISMISS- |
| 16 | Defendant. | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | 00000 | |
| 19 | Plaintiff Barbara Ratcliffe brought this action against | |
| 20 | defendant Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, doing business as Cache Creek | |
| 21 | Casino Resort, alleging employment discrimination and wrongful | |
| 22 | termination under California law. (Docket No. 1.) Defendant now | |
| 23 | moves to dismiss the action for lack of subject matter | |
| 24 | jurisdiction. (Docket No. 4.) Plaintiff has not filed any | |
| 25 | opposition to the motion and the time to do so has passed. <u>See</u> | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | 1 The motion is decided on the papers without oral argument pursuant to Local Rule 230. The scheduled January 6, | |
| 28 | 2025 hearing on the motion is her | _ |
| | · | - |

Case 2:24-cv-02748-WBS-CSK Document 6 Filed 12/12/24 Page 2 of 2

| 1 | L.R. 230(c). | |
|-----|--|--|
| 2 | Federal courts have original jurisdiction over actions | |
| 3 | arising under federal law. 28 U.S.C. § 1331. This action does | |
| 4 | not arise under federal law, as plaintiff brings only California | |
| 5 | state law claims. (<u>See</u> Docket No. 1.) | |
| 6 | Federal courts also have original jurisdiction over | |
| 7 | cases where complete diversity exists between the parties and the | |
| 8 | amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). | |
| 9 | "[U]nincorporated Indian tribes cannot sue or be sued in | |
| LO | diversity because they are not citizens of any state." Am. | |
| L1 | Vantage Cos. v. Table Mountain Rancheria, 292 F.3d 1091, 1095 | |
| L2 | (9th Cir. 2002). Accordingly, this court cannot exercise | |
| L3 | diversity jurisdiction over defendant. | |
| L4 | Because neither federal question nor diversity | |
| L5 | jurisdiction is present, plaintiff has not met her burden of | |
| L 6 | demonstrating that the court has subject matter jurisdiction, \underline{se} | |
| L7 | Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am., 511 U.S. 375, 377 | |
| L8 | (1994). | |
| L 9 | IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendant's motion to | |
| 20 | dismiss (Docket No. 4) be, and the same hereby is, GRANTED. The | |
| 21 | Clerk of Court is directed to close this case. | |
| 22 | Dated: December 12, 2024 | |
| 23 | WILLIAM B. SHUBB | |

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE