

1 Michele Ballard Miller (SBN 104198)
mbmiller@cozen.com
2 Austin G. Dieter (SBN 305638)
adieter@cozen.com
3 COZEN O'CONNOR
101 Montgomery Street, Suite 1400
4 Fresno, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 644-0914
5 Facsimile: (415) 644-0978

6 Attorneys for Defendant
CARGILL MEAT SOLUTIONS
7 CORPORATION

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 DELFINA SOTO DE CORTES, an individual,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 CARGILL MEAT SOLUTIONS
CORPORATION, a corporation and DOES 1-
15 10, Inclusive,

16 Defendants.
17

Case No.:

**NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF ACTION
FROM STATE COURT PURUSANT
TO DIVERSITY JURISDICTION
UNDER 28 U.S.C § 1441(b)**

COZEN O'CONNOR
101 MONTGOMERY ST, SUITE 1400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

1 **TO THE CLERK OF THE ABOVE-ENTITLED COURT:**

2
3 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441(b) and 1446,
4 Defendant **CARGILL MEAT SOLUTIONS CORPORATION** (“Defendant”), a Delaware
5 corporation with its principal place of business in Wichita, Kansas, at 151 North Main Street,
6 hereby removes the above-captioned action from the Superior Court of the State of California,
7 County of Fresno, to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California on the
8 following grounds.

9
10 **I. INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

11
12 1. This Court has original jurisdiction over this action under the diversity
13 jurisdiction statute. 28 U.S.C. § 1332. In relevant part, diversity jurisdiction grants district courts
14 original jurisdiction over civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value
15 of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between citizens of different states. 28 U.S.C §
16 1332. As set forth below, this case meets all of the diversity jurisdiction statutory requirements for
17 removal and is timely and properly removed by the filing of this Notice.

18
19 2. On November 24, 2020, an action was commenced in the Superior Court of
20 the State of California in and for the County of Fresno, entitled *DELFINA SOTO DE CORTES*,
21 *Plaintiff*, v. *CARGILL MEAT SOLUTIONS CORPORATION*, a corporation, and *DOES 1-10*,
22 *Defendants*, as case number 20CECG03464 (“Complaint”). The Complaint alleged the following
23 nine causes of action: 1) Disability discrimination in violation of the California Fair Employment
24 and Housing Act (“FEHA”); 2) Failure to accommodate; 3) Failure to engage in interactive
25 process; 4) Retaliation in violation of the FEHA; 5) Wrongful termination in violation of public
26 policy; 6) Violation of Labor Code § 1102.5; 7) Violation of Labor Code §201; 8) Violation of
27

1 Labor Code §203; and 9) Failure to allow inspection of personal file. A true and correct copy of
2 the Summons and Complaint is attached to the Declaration of Austin Dieter as **Exhibit A**.

3
4 3. On December 9, 2020, Plaintiff Delfina Soto De Cortes (“Plaintiff”), mailed
5 a copy of the summons and complaint to the Defendant pursuant to California Code of Civil
6 Procedure section 415.30 along with a Notice and Acknowledgment of Receipt. On December 28,
7 2020, in compliance with Section 415.30, Defendant signed the Notice of Acknowledgment of
8 Receipt, thereby starting the 30 day period in which Defendant could Answer. A true and accurate
9 copy of the Notice and Acknowledgment of Receipt is attached to the Declaration of Austin Dieter
10 as **Exhibit B**.

11
12 4. On January 22, 2021, Defendant filed an Answer to Plaintiff’s Complaint
13 in the Fresno County Superior Court. A true and correct copy of Defendant’s Answer has been
14 attached to the Declaration of Austin Dieter as **Exhibit C**.

15
16 5. The instant Notice of Removal has been timely filed, having been filed
17 within 30 days after Defendant’s acknowledgement of receipt of a copy of Plaintiff’s civil
18 Complaint setting forth removable claims. 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b).

19
20 **II. DIVERSITY JURISDICTION**

21
22 6. This Court has original jurisdiction over this civil action under 28 U.S.C. §
23 1332, which provides that the federal district courts have original jurisdiction in actions “where
24 the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interests and costs,
25 and is between - (1) citizens of different states.” Accordingly, this action may be removed pursuant
26 to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b) because the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000 and Plaintiff and
27 Defendant are citizens of different states.

1 **A. Diversity Jurisdiction Exists Because Plaintiff And Defendant Are Citizens Of**
2 **Different States.**

3 7. This action satisfies the complete diversity of citizenship requirement of 28
4 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1). For diversity purposes, a person is a “citizen” of the state in which she is
5 domiciled. *Kantor v. Wellesley Galleries, Ltd.*, 704 F.2d 1088, 1090 (9th Cir. 1983). Residence is
6 *prima facie* evidence of domicile. *State Farm Mut. Ins. Co. v. Dyer*, 19 F.3d 514, 520 (10th Cir.
7 1994). Upon information and belief, Plaintiff is a resident of California. (See Ex. A, ¶ 1 (“Plaintiff
8 . . . is an individual who, at all times herein, worked in the City of Fresno, State of California.”).
9 As such, Plaintiff is a citizen of California for purposes of diversity jurisdiction.

10
11 8. A corporation is a citizen of the state where (i) it has been incorporated; and
12 where (ii) its principal place of business is located. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c). The principal place of
13 business for a corporation is determined by the location of its “nerve center,” which includes the
14 location of its headquarters and the location where its “officers direct, control and coordinate the
15 corporation’s activities. *Hertz Corp. v. Friend*, 559 U.S. 77, 78 (2010).

16
17 9. Defendant is incorporated in the state of Delaware and its principal place of
18 business is in Wichita, Kansas where its headquarters is located at 151 North Main Street, Wichita,
19 KS 67202. (Decl. of Les Icton, at ¶ 6.) Therefore, it is a citizen of both Delaware and Kansas.

20
21 10. As such, Plaintiff and Defendant are completely diverse of citizenship and
22 the citizenship prong of the diversity jurisdiction requirements is met.

23 **B. Diversity Jurisdiction Exists Because The Amount In Controversy Exceeds \$75,000.**

24
25 11. For purposes of jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, the sum demanded in
26 the complaint shall be deemed to be the amount in controversy, but in instances where the
27 complaint does not specify an amount in controversy, the defendant may assert that it exceeds the
28

1 threshold if state practice “permits recovery of damages in excess of the amount demanded.” *See*
2 28 U.S.C. § 1446(c)(2)(A)(ii).

3
4 12. Though Plaintiff’s state court Complaint does not specify a particular
5 amount of damages in the prayer for relief, it is clear from the body of the Complaint that she will
6 seek over \$75,000. (*See generally*, Ex. A.) Plaintiff is explicitly seeking to recover compensatory
7 damages in the form of lost wages and benefits, and emotional distress “in excess of \$50,000”.
8 (Ex. A, p. 15.) Plaintiff also seeks an additional \$1,980 in unpaid vacation hours and penalties for
9 violations of state labor code claims (*Id.*) These amounts, combined with Plaintiff’s purported non-
10 economic and punitive damages, as discussed in paragraphs 13-15 below, establish an amount in
11 controversy in excess of \$75,000.

12
13 13. When the amount in controversy is not definite from the face of the
14 Complaint, in order to prevent removal of an action based on diversity jurisdiction, a plaintiff must
15 file a binding stipulation or affidavit with his or her Complaint stating that the amount in
16 controversy does not exceed \$75,000. *DeAguilar v. Boeing*, 47 F.3d 1404, 1412 (5th Cir. 1992)
17 (per curium). Plaintiff did not file any such stipulation or affidavit with her Complaint. In any
18 event, it is apparent from the allegations in the Complaint and the damages that Plaintiff seeks that
19 the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.

20
21 14. Notwithstanding the above, Plaintiff’s non-economic damages alone could
22 easily exceed \$75,000. For example, in *Roby v. Mckesson Corp.*, 47 Cal. 4th 686, 699 (2009), the
23 plaintiff alleged similar causes of action as Plaintiff does here, including claims under California’s
24 Fair Employment and Housing Act (“FEHA”) and a claim for wrongful termination. The jury
25 awarded the plaintiff \$800,000 in non-economic past and future damages for her FEHA
26 discrimination and wrongful termination claims, plus \$15 million in punitive damages. *Id.*; *see*
27 *also Simmons v. PCR Technology*, 209 F. Supp. 2d 1029, 1033 (N.D. Cal. 2002) (denying
28

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.