

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

MICHAEL HENRY BLANK,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 4:18-CV-780 JAR
)	
JOHN DOE, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff Michael Henry Blank’s response to the Court’s order to show cause. (Docket No. 4). For the reasons discussed below, the Court will dismiss plaintiff’s complaint without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

Background

Plaintiff filed his pro se complaint on May 21, 2018. (Docket No. 1). The complaint names John Doe and Jane Doe as defendants. (Docket No. 1 at 5). Plaintiff alleges that John Doe and Jane Doe both committed libel against him in a blog post on a website called Avenger Social. This blog is hosted by WordPress, which is owned by Automattic, Inc., a Delaware corporation. Neither WordPress nor Automattic, Inc. is named as parties to this suit.

Plaintiff alleges that John Doe blogs under the handle “Jaybyrdtoldtweety,” or simply, “Jaybyrd.” On May 28, 2016, John Doe posted a blog entry titled: “Mr. Not So Hardness Michael H. Blank.” According to plaintiff, John Doe claimed the post originated from an email sent to him by Jane Doe, who is referenced in the post as “The Women of Twitter.” The blog post includes several screenshots of plaintiff’s Twitter posts, as well as screenshots of what purports to be plaintiff’s Amazon wish list. (Docket No. 4, Ex. 8). The post also contains

commentary that allegedly suggests that plaintiff is impotent; that plaintiff is a crossdresser; and that plaintiff harasses and abuses women. (Docket No. 1 at 5). Plaintiff asserts that Jane Doe emailed the information to John Doe, who posted Jane Doe's email with some additional commentary.

Plaintiff's complaint states that he lives in Chesterfield, Missouri. (Docket No. 1 at 2). However, with regards to John Doe and Jane Doe, he does not provide a job or title, street address, city and county, state and zip code, telephone number, or email address. In short, there is no information as to the citizenship of John Doe or Jane Doe. (Docket No. 1 at 2, 7).

Plaintiff seeks \$10,000 in actual damages for the time he spent addressing the blog post, and a further \$500,000 in punitive damages based on the "post's targeted and malicious nature." (Docket No. 1 at 6). He asserts diversity of citizenship as the basis for this Court's jurisdiction.

On August 13, 2018, the Court ordered plaintiff to show cause why his case should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (Docket No. 3). The Court noted that plaintiff has the burden of establishing diversity of the parties, but has not done so, due to the fact that he has named fictitious parties. Plaintiff was given twenty-one days in which to show cause why his case should not be dismissed.

Plaintiff filed a response to the Court's show cause order on September 4, 2018. (Docket No. 4). His filing acknowledges that no federal question exists and his ability to continue his case rests upon determining total diversity of the parties involved. (Docket No. 4 at 1).

Plaintiff states that he has attempted to identify the parties allegedly liable for defaming him, but has been unable to do so. He has obtained internet protocol (IP) addresses for both the Avenger Social website, which is hosted by WordPress, an Automattic Company, and for Tutanota, the email provider for Avenger Social. Based on the IP addresses, plaintiff has

determined that the Avenger Social website has a physical location of San Francisco, California. The main IP address of Tutanota, the email provider, returned a physical location in Germany. (Docket No. 4 at 2). Plaintiff acknowledges that identifying Jane Doe “definitively” will depend on determining John Doe’s identity and compelling his disclosure of her identity.

In order to determine the identities of the two defendants, plaintiff requests that the Court grant his “Ex Parte Motion for Expedited Discovery.” If granted, plaintiff intends to issue third-party subpoenas to Automattic’s Word Press Company and, if necessary, to Twitter. He asserts that these subpoenas will allow him to establish the “legal name, address, phone number and other relevant information to determine if the proper diversity exists with defendants John Doe and Jane Doe.” (Docket No. 4 at 2-3).

Discussion

The Court’s order of August 13, 2018, directed plaintiff to show cause in writing why his case should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (Docket No. 3). Specifically, the Court noted that plaintiff was asserting jurisdiction based on diversity of citizenship, but that his complaint named two fictitious parties as defendants. Because the citizenship of the fictitious parties could not be determined, plaintiff had not carried his burden of establishing the existence of diversity jurisdiction. Plaintiff’s response to the Court has not rectified this deficiency.

A. Failure to Establish Diversity Jurisdiction

Subject matter jurisdiction refers to a court’s power to decide a certain class of cases. *LeMay v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 450 F.3d 797, 799 (8th Cir. 2006). “Federal courts are not courts of general jurisdiction; they have only the power that is authorized by Article III of the Constitution and the statutes enacted by Congress pursuant thereto.” *Bender v. Williamsport Area Sch. Dist.*, 475 U.S. 534, 541 (1986). *See also Gunn v. Minton*, 568 U.S. 251, 256 (2013) (“Federal courts

are courts of limited jurisdiction, possessing only that power authorized by Constitution and statute”). The presence of subject matter jurisdiction is a threshold requirement that must be assured in every federal case. *Kronholm v. Fed. Deposit Ins. Corp.*, 915 F.2d 1171, 1174 (8th Cir. 1990). See also *Sanders v. Clemco Indus.*, 823 F.2d 214, 216 (8th Cir. 1987) (“The threshold requirement in every federal case is jurisdiction and we have admonished the district court to be attentive to a satisfaction of jurisdictional requirements in all cases”). As such, the issue of subject matter jurisdiction may be raised at any time, by any party or the court. *Gray v. City of Valley Park, Mo.*, 567 F.3d 976, 982 (8th Cir. 2009).

Federal courts have subject matter jurisdiction over both federal question cases and diversity of citizenship cases. See *Auto-Owners Ins. Co. v. Tribal Court of Spirit Lake Indian Reservation*, 495 F.3d 1017, 1020 (8th Cir. 2007) (finding that subject matter jurisdiction is lacking if neither diversity of citizenship nor federal question jurisdiction applies); *McLaurin v. Prater*, 30 F.3d 982, 984-85 (8th Cir. 1994) (noting that Congress has directed that district courts shall have jurisdiction in both federal question and diversity cases). In this case, plaintiff acknowledges there is no basis for federal question jurisdiction. (Docket No. 4 at 1). Accordingly, in order to establish the existence of subject matter jurisdiction, he must rely on diversity of the parties.

“Under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a), district courts have original diversity jurisdiction over civil actions when the matter in controversy exceeds \$75,000, without considering interest and costs, and when the citizenship of each plaintiff is different from the citizenship of each defendant.” *Ryan ex rel. Ryan v. Schneider Nat. Carriers, Inc.*, 263 F.3d 816, 819 (8th Cir. 2001). A complaint making a good faith allegation of the jurisdictional amount is sufficient to confer jurisdiction. *Scottsdale Ins. Co. v. Universal Crop Prot. All., LLC*, 620 F.3d 926, 931 (8th Cir.

2010). However, a “complaint will be dismissed if it appears to a legal certainty that the claim is really for less than the jurisdictional amount.” *Id. See also Kopp v. Kopp*, 280 F.3d 883, 884 (8th Cir. 2002). “The legal certainty standard is met where the legal impossibility of recovery is so certain as virtually to negate the plaintiff’s good faith in asserting the claim.” *Peterson v. The Travelers Indem. Co.*, 867 F.3d 992, 995 (8th Cir. 2017).

“Complete diversity of citizenship exists where no defendant holds citizenship in the same state where any plaintiff holds citizenship.” *OnePoint Solutions, LLC v. Borchert*, 486 F.3d 342, 346 (8th Cir. 2007). For purposes of diversity, state citizenship requires an individual’s physical presence in the state coupled with an indefinite intention to remain there. *Blakemore v. Missouri Pac. R.R. Co.*, 789 F.2d 616, 618 (8th Cir. 1986).

In his complaint, plaintiff lists two fictitious parties, John Doe and Jane Doe, as defendants. He has not provided a job or title, street address, city and county, state and zip code, telephone number, or email address for either defendant. Rather, plaintiff states that this information is “unknown.” Likewise, plaintiff’s response to the Court’s order to show cause also fails to provide information regarding the citizenship of John Doe or Jane Doe.

The party asserting diversity jurisdiction has the burden of establishing it. *Hertz Corp. v. Friend*, 559 U.S. 77, 96 (2010). “Given this burden, the general rule has been that, on challenge, the diverse citizenship of the fictitious defendants must be established by the plaintiff in order to continue a federal court action.” *Lee v. Airgas Mid-South, Inc.*, 793 F.3d 894, 899 (8th Cir. 2015). *See also Howell by Goerdts v. Tribune Entm’t Co.*, 106 F.3d 215, 218 (7th Cir. 1997) (“[B]ecause the existence of diversity jurisdiction cannot be determined without knowledge of every defendants’ place of citizenship, ‘John Doe’ defendants are not permitted in federal diversity suits”). As plaintiff has not ascertained the citizenship of the fictitious parties named in his

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.