

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
SOUTH BEND DIVISION

RICHARD A. SWOBODA)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 3:14-cv-490 JD
)	
PATRICK BLANKENSHIP, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

OPINION AND ORDER

In this matter, Richard A. Swoboda, a pro se plaintiff, asserts various claims arising under state law, such as malicious prosecution, fraud, slander, and malpractice, against several judges, attorneys, and a law firm, related to matters he has litigated in the state courts. However, he did not assert any claims arising under federal law, such as would invoke this Court’s federal question jurisdiction, nor did he allege facts that would support diversity jurisdiction. The defendants responded with several motions to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction (both for failure to plead jurisdiction and based on the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine) and due to judicial immunity. On June 30, 2014, Judge Springmann granted the motions to dismiss, finding that Mr. Swoboda had not properly alleged jurisdiction. Because Mr. Swoboda had not given any indication that he could cure the jurisdictional defects, the Court did not grant leave to amend. [DE 42]. Judge Springmann thus stated that the complaint was “dismissed with prejudice,” and the Clerk of the Court entered a judgment reflecting that order. Judge Springmann subsequently recused herself, and the case was randomly reassigned to the undersigned.

Mr. Swoboda has submitted various filings since the dismissal of his case, but none of them present grounds for reconsidering the dismissal of his claim for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. However, in his July 2, 2014 filing, Mr. Swoboda states, “The plaintiff does have

