

1)

===== Start of Answer 1 (1094 words) =====

1. Valid Service

A. Valerie

The issue is whether Paul validly served the summons on Valerie.

Any person at least 18 years old and not a party to the action may properly serve a party to the action with service of process. The process server may properly serve process by delivering a summons and a copy of the complaint personally to the party, to an agent of the party authorized to receive service of process, by leaving service of process with a member of the party's household of proper age and discretion, or by sending two copies of the complaint and a summons to a party by certified mail, with return receipt requested.

Here, Paul, a citizen of Mexico, is attending college in San Diego on a student visa. Because he is attending college, Paul is most likely at least 18 years old. However, Paul is a party to the action. Paul is suing Valerie and personally handed her a summons and a copy of the complaint. Paul may not personally deliver service of process to Valerie because he is a party to the action.

Thus, Paul did not validly serve the summons on Valerie because Paul is a party to the action.

B. Meyer Corp.

The issue is whether Paul validly served the summons on Meyer Corp.

The rules for valid service of process are stated above.

Here, Paul sent a summons and copy of the complaint to Meyer Corp. by ordinary mail to the company's address in Germany. This service was not valid for two reasons. First, Paul should have sent service of process by certified mail with return receipt requested. By sending service through ordinary mail, Paul cannot confirm whether Meyer Corp. actually received the complaint.

Thus, Paul did not validly serve the summons on Meyer Corp. because he did not send the complaint by certified mail and did not include two copies of the complaint.

2. Personal Jurisdiction

A. Valerie

ID: [REDACTED] (CALBAR_7-16_Q1-3) July 2016 California Bar Examination

The issue is whether the Superior Court of California in San Diego (the "SD Superior Court") has personal jurisdiction over Valerie.

A court may exercise personal jurisdiction over a person because of the person's residence within the jurisdiction, consent to jurisdiction, service within the court's jurisdiction, minimum contacts with the jurisdiction, and if the party conducts substantial business within the court's jurisdiction.

Here, Valerie is a citizen of California and a resident of San Francisco. There are no facts indicating that Valerie has consented to the court's jurisdiction and she was invalidly served with process in San Francisco. There are no facts indicating that Valerie has the minimum contacts with San Diego or conducts substantial business within the SD Superior Court's jurisdiction. Accordingly, the SD Superior Court cannot exercise personal jurisdiction over Valerie.

Thus, the SD Superior Court does not have personal jurisdiction over Valerie.

B. Meyer Corp.

The issue is whether the SD Superior Court has personal jurisdiction over Meyer Corp.

A court may exercise jurisdiction over a corporation in the corporation's place of incorporation and where the corporation's headquarters are located, the "nerve center" of the corporation where executives control and manage the corporation. A court may also exercise jurisdiction over a corporation if its interactions with a forum state are so close that the corporation is "essentially at home" in that court's jurisdiction. When deciding whether to exercise jurisdiction over a company, a court will also look to notions of fairness in terms of whether the company purposely availed itself to the forum state's jurisdiction by targeting customers of the state and whether the company could fairly expect to be subject to personal jurisdiction in that court's jurisdiction.

Here, Meyer Corp. is a German company with its sole place of business in Germany. There are no facts indicating that Meyer Corp. consented to the court's jurisdiction, or that it has minimum contacts or conducts substantial business in San Diego. There are no facts indicating that Meyer Corp. purposely directed its snacks towards San Diegan customers or intended to expose itself to the SD Superior Court's jurisdiction. Therefore, it would be unfair to expose Meyer Corp. to the SD Superior Court's jurisdiction as it could not have expected to be called to court in San Diego and seemingly had no purposeful contacts with the forum state.

Thus, the SD Superior Court does not have personal jurisdiction over Meyer Corp.

3. Venue

ID: [REDACTED] (CALBAR_7-16_Q1-3) July 2016 California Bar Examination

The issue is whether venue properly lies in the SD Superior Court.

When a court does not have personal jurisdiction over a party to the action, venue may still be proper if that party consents to venue within the court's jurisdiction or if the injury occurs within that venue.

Here, as explained above, the SD Superior Court cannot properly exercise personal jurisdiction over Valerie or Meyer Corp. and neither consented to the court's venue. Further, the injury, Paul's consumption of the contaminated snacks that caused his injuries, occurred in San Francisco, not San Diego.

Thus, venue does not properly lie in the SD Superior Court.

4. Removability

The issue is whether Paul's action is properly removable to federal court.

Subject Matter Jurisdiction

In order to properly remove an action to federal court, the federal court must have originally been able to exercise jurisdiction over the case. A federal court can exercise federal question jurisdiction or diversity jurisdiction.

Federal Question Jurisdiction

A federal court has jurisdiction if the action presents a federal question, claim that involves an issue of federal law. The federal issue must be within the original claim and not merely asserted as a defense to an action.

Here, Paul's claim does not present a federal question. He filed a pro se action against Valerie and Meyer Corp. related to his injuries resulting from consuming a toxic substance in snacks manufactured by Meyer Corp. and given to him by Valerie.

Accordingly, the federal court would not have federal question jurisdiction.

Diversity Jurisdiction

A federal court may exercise diversity jurisdiction when the amount of plaintiff's claims exceeds \$75,000 and plaintiff is subject to personal jurisdiction in a different state than all of the defendants. A defendant may not remove an action filed in state court to federal court based on diversity jurisdiction if that defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in the state where the action is filed.

Here, Paul filed an action for \$50,000 in compensatory damages against Valerie and Meyer Corp. \$50,000 does not exceed \$75,000 and the federal court could not properly assert diversity jurisdiction.

ID: [REDACTED] (CALBAR_7-16_Q1-3) July 2016 California Bar Examination

Accordingly, the federal court would not have diversity jurisdiction.

Thus, Paul's action cannot be properly removed to federal court.

Question #1 Final Word Count = 1094

===== End of Answer #1 =====