

defendants. Notwithstanding, plaintiff fails to establish subject matter jurisdiction before this court.

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. “For jurisdiction to exist under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, there must be complete diversity between the parties, which is to say that the plaintiff may not be a citizen of the same state as any defendant.” *Bush v. Butler*, 521 F. Supp. 2d 63, 71 (D.D.C. 2007) (citing *Owen Equip. & Erection Co. v. Kroger*, 437 U.S. 365, 373-74 (1978)).

Plaintiff has failed to established diversity jurisdiction because she has named a defendant that is domiciled in the District of Columbia, namely, FACES, LLC, therefore complete diversity is defeated. Additionally, she must also allege, in good faith, that she has suffered damages exceeding \$75,000, *see Pietrangelo v. Refresh Club, Inc.*, No. 18-cv-1943 (DLF), 2019 WL 2357379 at *6 (D.D.C. June 4, 2019) (citing *Dart Cherokee Basin Operating Co., LLC v. Owens*, 135 S. Ct. 547, 553 (2014)), which she has not done.

Plaintiff has also failed to state a federal question. She attempts to invoke a federal statute, however, 18 U.S.C. § 1341, deals with criminal offenses and has no corresponding private right of action. *Wiggins v. Philip Morris, Inc.*, 853 F. Supp. 458, 466 (D.D.C. 1994) (citing *Official Publications, Inc. v. Kable News Co.*, 884 F.2d 664, 667 (2d Cir. 1989) (“18 U.S.C. §§ 1341 . . . [does] not provide a private right of action.”) and *Ryan v. Ohio Edison Co.*, 611 F.2d 1170, 1179 (6th Cir. 1979) (holding same)). Consequently, there is also no basis to support federal question jurisdiction.

