

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

ROBERT CLARK BLACKFORD,)	
)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>)	
)	
v.)	No. 1:14-cv-01717-JMS-DKL
)	
CHASE BANK,)	
)	
<i>Defendant.</i>)	

ORDER


On April 3, 2015, *pro se* Plaintiff Robert Blackford filed an Amended Complaint, [[Filing No. 12](#)], which addressed some of the jurisdictional issues noted in the Court’s March 20, 2015 Order, [[Filing No. 11](#)]. Specifically, Mr. Blackford properly alleged his citizenship and the citizenship of Defendant Chase Bank (“Chase”). [[Filing No. 12.](#)] But, while Mr. Blackford provided more detailed information regarding the amount of compensatory and punitive damages he is seeking, he still did not allege that the amount in controversy in this matter exceeds “\$75,000, *exclusive of interest and costs,*” as it must for this Court to have diversity jurisdiction. [28 U.S.C. § 1332](#) (emphasis added).

Because the Amended Complaint is still unclear regarding the amount in controversy, and since Chase has expressed skepticism regarding whether the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000 exclusive of interest and costs, [*see* [Filing No. 7 at 2-3](#)], the Court finds it prudent to require that the parties file a joint jurisdictional statement detailing their views regarding the amount in controversy. The Court is not being hyper-technical: A federal court always has a

responsibility to ensure that it has jurisdiction, [Hukic v. Aurora Loan Servs., 588 F.3d 420, 427 \(7th Cir. 2009\)](#).

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** the parties to meet and confer, and conduct whatever investigation necessary, to determine whether this Court has diversity jurisdiction. If the parties agree that diversity jurisdiction is proper, they shall file a joint jurisdictional statement by **April 22, 2015** setting forth the basis for each of their citizenships and whether they agree that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000 exclusive of interest and costs. If the parties cannot agree on their respective citizenships or the amount in controversy, any party who disagrees shall file a separate jurisdictional statement by **April 22, 2015** setting forth its views on those issues.

April 9, 2015

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jane Magnus-Stinson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style. The name "Jane" is written in a larger, more prominent script, while "Magnus-Stinson" follows in a similar but slightly smaller script. The signature is positioned above a horizontal line.

Hon. Jane Magnus-Stinson, Judge
United States District Court
Southern District of Indiana

Distribution via United States Mail to:

Robert Clark Blackford
8318 E. State Road 267
Plainfield, IN 46168

Distribution via ECF only to all counsel of record