

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 FORT WORTH DIVISION

TINA R. COOPER, ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

NO. 4:13-CV-127-A

MEMORANDUM OPINION
 and
ORDER

The court has not been persuaded that it has subject matter jurisdiction over the above-captioned action. Therefore, the court is ordering the action remanded to the state court from which it was removed.

I.

Background

On February 4, 2013, plaintiffs, Tina R. Cooper and Tyrece Cooper, initiated this action by the filing of their original petition and application for temporary restraining order in the District Court of Tarrant County, Texas, 342nd Judicial District, against defendant, Bank of America, N.A. By notice of removal filed February 18, 2013, defendant removed the action to this court, alleging that this court had subject matter jurisdiction by reason of diversity of citizenship, as contemplated by 28

U.S.C. § 1332, and that the amount in controversy exceeded the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, as contemplated by § 1332(a).

Defendant contended in the notice of removal that "[w]hen injunctive relief is sought, the amount in controversy is measured by the value of the object of the litigation." Notice of Removal at 2-3 (footnote and internal quotation marks omitted). Defendant further contended that when a mortgagor seeks to protect his entire property, "the fair market value of the property is the proper measure of the amount in controversy." Id. at 3 (footnote omitted). Defendant claimed that the value of plaintiffs' property is at least \$122,500.00, establishing that the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional minimum.

Because of a concern that defendants had not provided the court with information that would enable the court to find the existence of the requisite jurisdictional amount, the court on June 14, 2012, ordered defendants to file an amended notice of removal, together with supporting documentation, showing that the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional amount. Defendants timely complied with the court's order.

II.

Basic Principles

The court starts with a statement of basic principles

announced by the Fifth Circuit:

"The removing party bears the burden of showing that federal subject matter jurisdiction exists and that removal was proper." Manguno v. Prudential Prop. & Cas. Ins. Co., 276 F.3d 720, 723 (5th Cir. 2002). "Moreover, because the effect of removal is to deprive the state court of an action properly before it, removal raises significant federalism concerns, which mandate strict construction of the removal statute."¹ Carpenter v. Wichita Falls Indep. Sch. Dist., 44 F.3d 362, 365-66 (5th Cir. 1995). Any doubts about whether removal jurisdiction is proper must therefore be resolved against the exercise of federal jurisdiction. Acuna v. Brown & Root Inc., 200 F.3d 335, 339 (5th Cir. 2000).

To determine the amount in controversy, the court ordinarily looks to the plaintiff's state court petition. Manguno, 276 F.3d at 723. If it is not facially apparent from the petition that the amount in controversy exceeds the required amount, the removing party must set forth summary judgment-type evidence, either in the notice of removal or in an affidavit, showing that the amount in controversy is, more likely than not, greater than \$75,000. Id.; Allen v. R & H Oil & Gas Co., 63 F.3d 1326, 1335

¹The removal statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a) provides, in pertinent part, that: [A]ny civil action brought in a State court of which the district courts of the United States have original jurisdiction, may be removed by the defendant or the defendants, to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place where such action is pending. (emphasis added).

(5th Cir. 1995). The amount in controversy is measured from the perspective of the plaintiff. See Garcia v. Koch Oil Co. of Texas Inc., 351 F.3d 636, 640 n.4 (5th Cir. 2003).

III.

The True Nature of Plaintiffs' Claims

The petition by which plaintiffs initiated this action in the state court does not specify a dollar amount of recovery sought, nor does it define in any way the value of the right sought to be protected or the extent of the injury sought to be prevented. Rather, the allegations of the petition are typical of many state court petitions that are brought before this court by notices of removal in which the plaintiff makes vague, general, and obviously legally baseless allegations in an attempt to frustrate the procedures a lender is pursuing, or has pursued, to regain possession of residential property the plaintiff used as security for the making of a loan.

As the court has been required to do in other cases of this kind, the court has undertaken an evaluation of the true nature of plaintiffs' claims. Having done so, and having considered the authorities and arguments cited by defendant in the amended notice of removal, the court remains unpersuaded that the amount in controversy exceeds the required jurisdictional minimum.

In the amended notice of removal defendant essentially reurges the arguments made in the original notice of removal:

plaintiffs are seeking to enjoin foreclosure proceedings on their property, thus the object of the litigation is the property; and the value of the object of the litigation--the property--constitutes the amount in controversy. Defendant cites to other district court cases in support of its arguments, none of which persuade the court that the value of the property constitutes the amount in controversy.

To sum up, defendants have not shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the amount in controversy in this action exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs. Therefore, the court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over the action, and it should be remanded to the state court from which it was removed.


IV.

Order

Therefore,

The court ORDERS that this action be, and is hereby, remanded to the state court from which it was removed.

SIGNED March 7, 2013.



JOHN MCBRYDE
United States District Judge