

Second, the court has reviewed the documents filed before the 30-day period for removal

expired, and they include the summonses that plaintiffs allege are missing. Remand is not appropriate for failure to file all necessary state court documents.

Finally, plaintiffs misrepresent the holding of the New York federal court. The court did not hold that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over the Melo defendants. Rather, it determined that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over one claim. The court then dismissed that particular claim against all other defendants on its merits. Plaintiffs do not present a valid reason for remanding this case to state court.

Because the court finds no merit in plaintiffs' contentions, sanctions are also not warranted.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and for Sanctions with Memorandum (Doc. 4) is denied.

Dated this 3rd day of September 2010, at Kansas City, Kansas.

s/ Carlos Murguia
CARLOS MURGUIA
United States District Judge