

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

CLINT PHILLIPS III,

Plaintiff,

v.

US AIR FORCE and SCOTT AIR FORCE  
BASE,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:17-cv-01079-JPG-SCW

**MEMORANDUM & ORDER**

**J. PHIL GILBERT, DISTRICT JUDGE**

This matter comes before the Court on its own initiative for purposes of case management. Pro se plaintiff Clint Phillips is attempting to sue the United States Air Force and Scott Air Force Base for alleged false imprisonment and several other claims. Federal courts, however, are courts of limited jurisdiction. They may exercise jurisdiction only over matters authorized by the Constitution and by statute. *Turner/Ozanne v. Hyman/Power*, 111 F.3d 1312, 1316 (7th Cir. 1997). Moreover, federal courts must police the boundaries of their own jurisdiction. Even absent an objection by a party challenging jurisdiction, they are “obliged to inquire *sua sponte* whenever a doubt arises as to the existence of federal jurisdiction.” *Tylka v. Gerber Prods. Co.*, 211 F.3d 445, 448–49 (7th Cir. 2000) (quoting *Mt. Healthy City Bd. of Educ. v. Doyle*, 429 U.S. 274, 278 (1977)). As such, this Court conducts a rigorous initial review of complaints to ensure that jurisdiction has been properly pled.

Here, Phillips has not adequately pled any form of subject-matter jurisdiction. If Phillips wishes to bring an action under *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), he must amend his complaint and allege as such. Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that Phillips shall have up to and including November 2, 2017 to correct this and any other jurisdictional

defects in his complaint. *See Tylka*, 211 F.3d at 448 (“[I]t is not the court's obligation to lead counsel through a jurisdictional paint-by-numbers scheme.”). Should he fail to do so, the Court will dismiss this matter for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED: October 13, 2017**

s/ J. Phil Gilbert  
**J. PHIL GILBERT**  
**DISTRICT JUDGE**