

OCT 22 2018

Defendants.

1

Plaintiff alleges that defendants violated his privacy. Compl. at 1. He posits that defendants “orchestrat[ed] a film” without his consent. As a result, he has suffered damage to his “mind, body, and emotional state.” *Id.* Plaintiff also alleges that defendants committed “other infractions” that he admits “are undetermined due to not completely seeing, knowing, and properly having documented what really happen[ed] through this whole time frame.” *Id.* He believes that defendants have been perpetuating these unknown “infractions” against him possibly “from the beginning of time to present.” *Id.* Plaintiff requests a trial with the “possibility of formal charges,” though the actual civil relief plaintiff seeks is completely unclear. *Id.*

The subject matter jurisdiction of the federal district courts is limited and is set forth generally at 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1332. Under those statutes, federal jurisdiction is available only when a “federal question” is presented or the parties are of diverse citizenship and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. A party seeking relief in the district court must at least plead facts that bring the suit within the court's jurisdiction. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Failure to plead such facts warrants dismissal of the action. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).

Plaintiff fails to raise any federal question. He also fails to satisfy the burden to establish diversity jurisdiction. Therefore, this case will be dismissed for want of subject matter jurisdiction, and plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel is denied as moot. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: October 16, 2018


United States District Judge