



Published by Bradley Arant Boult Cummings LLP

New Law Brings Significant Changes to Removal, Federal Jurisdiction, and Venue

As 2011 drew to a close, President Obama quietly signed into law a significant rewriting of the federal jurisdiction and venue statutes. The Federal Courts Jurisdiction and Venue Clarification Act of 2011 (the "JVCA"), which passed Congress unanimously, took effect on January 6, 2012. Most notably for businesses that face litigation in state courts, the JVCA significantly affects how and when defendants can remove those cases to federal court:

Removal timing in cases with multiple defendants. In cases involving multiple defendants, the federal circuits had been split on when the clock started on the 30-day deadline for removal. Some circuits began counting the 30 days when the first defendant was served (or otherwise received the initial pleading), while other circuits allowed removal for 30 days after the last defendant was served. Under the JVCA, each defendant has 30 days from service to remove the case, regardless of when the other defendants were served. If an earlier-served defendant misses the deadline, it may still consent to a later-served defendant's removing the case (though the earlier-served defendant may not itself remove the case). The JVCA also codifies the longstanding judge-made rule that all defendants must consent to removal.

New exception to current one-year time limit on diversity removal. The old, ironclad rule that prevented diversity removal after one year from the filing of the case now has a limited exception. If the district court finds that the plaintiff acted in bad faith to prevent a defendant from removing the action, the court can permit the removal even if the one-year time limit has passed.

Amount in controversy changes. Defendants should now have an easier time demonstrating the necessary amount in controversy for diversity removals. If the complaint demands in excess of \$75,000, the amount-in-controversy requirement is satisfied. If the complaint does not demand a specific sum, a defendant may assert an amount in controversy in the notice of removal. The district court will evaluate the amount in controversy using a preponderance-of-the-evidence standard. Even if the complaint demands a sum lower than the statutory minimum, a defendant may still assert a higher amount in the notice of removal, so long as the relevant state would allow for recovery in excess of the sum demanded.

If a case is not removable solely because the amount-in-controversy requirement is not met, information obtained in the state court proceeding (including discovery) that relates to the amount in controversy can be used for an "other paper" removal. A defendant has one year from commencement of the action to remove a case based on "other paper," subject to the new bad-faith exception discussed above.

January 10, 2012

Related Attorneys



John E. Goodman 205.521.8476 jgoodman@babc.com



Cameron W. Ellis 205.521.8544 cellis@babc.com



Fritz Spainhour 205.521.8201 fspainhour@babc.com

January 10, 2012 1 www.babc.com

Sever and remand for nonremovable claims. If a case involves both removable and nonremovable claims, a defendant may remove the entire case to federal court. In such a case, the JVCA requires that, upon removal, the district court must sever the nonremovable claims and remand them to the state court.

In addition to these and other changes affecting removal, the JVCA also makes significant modifications to venue and transfer rules in the federal courts. You can find the full text of text of the JVCA by clicking here. The House Report, which details the reasons behind these changes, is available here.

Bradley Arant Boult Cummings LLP Office Locations:

ALABAMA

One Federal Place 1819 Fifth Avenue North Birmingham, AL 35203 205.521.8000

200 Clinton Avenue West, Suite 900 Huntsville, AL 35801 256.517.5100

The Alabama Center for Commerce 401 Adams Avenue, Suite 780 Montgomery, AL 36104 334.956.7700

MISSISSIPPI

188 E. Capitol Street, Suite 400 Jackson, MS 39201 601.948.8000

NORTH CAROLINA

100 North Tryon Street, Suite 2690 Charlotte, NC 28202 704.332.8842

TENNESSEE

1600 Division Street, Suite 700 Nashville, TN 37203 615.244.2582

WASHINGTON, DC

1615 L Street, N.W. Suite 1350 Washington, DC 20036 202.393.7150

To unsubscribe from this newsletter, email Jerry Young at jyoung@babc.com

This newsletter is a periodic publication of Bradley Arant Boult Cummings LLP and should not be construed as legal advice or legal opinions on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information only, and you are urged to consult your own lawyer or other tax advisor concerning your own situation and any specific legal questions you may have. For further information about these contents, please contact your lawyer or any of the lawyers in our practice group.

The Alabama State Bar requires the following disclosure: "No representation is made that the quality of the legal services to be performed is greater than the quality of legal services performed by other lawyers."

©2012 Bradley Arant Boult Cummings LLP

ALABAMA | DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | MISSISSIPPI | NORTH CAROLINA | TENNESSEE

