NOT FOR PUBLICATION

9 David Watson,

Mike Ives, et al.,

Plaintiff,

Defendants.

11 v.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

No. CV-17-01906-PHX-JJT

ORDER

At issue are *pro se* Plaintiff David Watson's Complaint (Doc. 1) and Amended Complaint (Doc. 4). For the reasons that follow, the Court will dismiss Plaintiff's Complaints with leave to refile in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules.

Plaintiff's Complaints (Docs. 1, 4) apparently attempt to raise a claim of trespass against ten Defendants, none of whom are identified by anything other than their names. The Complaints provide no basis for the Court to determine if it has subject matter jurisdiction over this case.

Unlike state courts, federal courts—including this Court—only have jurisdiction over a limited number of cases, and those cases typically involve either a controversy between citizens of different states ("diversity jurisdiction") or a question of federal law ("federal question jurisdiction"). See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332. The United States Supreme Court has stated that a federal court must not disregard or evade the limits on its subject matter jurisdiction. Owen Equip. & Erections Co. v. Kroger, 437 U.S. 365, 374

(1978). Thus, a federal court is obligated to inquire into its subject matter jurisdiction in each case and to dismiss a case when subject matter jurisdiction is lacking. *See Valdez v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 372 F.3d 1115, 1116 (9th Cir. 2004); Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) provides that a complaint must include "a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction" and "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." In other words, to proceed in federal court, a plaintiff must allege enough in the complaint for the court to conclude it has subject matter jurisdiction. *See* Charles Alan Wright & Arthur R. Miller, 5 Fed. Practice & Procedure § 1206 (3d ed. 2014). The complaint must also contain "sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)).

Plaintiff's Complaints lack any statement of the grounds for this Court's subject matter jurisdiction, as required by Rule 8(a). This defect alone is cause for the Court to dismiss the Complaints. *See Watson v. Chessman*, 362 F. Supp. 2d 1190, 1194 (S.D. Cal. 2005).

Plaintiff also fails to meet the Rule 8 requirements with regard to stating a claim. While Plaintiff alleges that Defendants trespassed upon his property, he does not allege who Defendants are or what they did that constituted trespass, let alone a legal basis for a claim against Defendants.

If a defective complaint can be cured, the plaintiff is entitled to amend the complaint before the action is dismissed. *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1127–30 (9th Cir. 2000). Here, the Court will give Plaintiff an opportunity to amend his Complaint and Amended Complaint, but any Second Amended Complaint must meet the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules, as indicated above.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. 1) and Amended Complaint (Doc. 4) are dismissed with permission to file a Second Amended Complaint by July 10, 2017.

Case 2:17-cv-01906-JJT Document 5 Filed 06/27/17 Page 3 of 3

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Plaintiff does not file a Second Amended Complaint by July 10, 2017, the Clerk shall dismiss this action without further Order of this Court. Dated this 27th day of June, 2017. United States District Judge