



For purposes of [28 U.S.C. § 1332](#), “diversity of citizenship” means that “the citizenship of each plaintiff is different from the citizenship of each defendant.” [Ryan v. Schneider Nat’l Carriers, Inc., 263 F.3d 816, 819 \(8th Cir. 2001\)](#). In addition, the amount in controversy must be greater than \$75,000.00 for diversity of citizenship jurisdiction. [28 U.S.C. § 1332\(a\)](#).

Here, Stack does not allege that his citizenship is different from the citizenship of each Defendant, nor has he alleged an amount in controversy. (Filing No. [35](#).) Thus, Stack has failed to establish diversity of citizenship jurisdiction as a basis for jurisdiction in this matter.

However, subject matter jurisdiction is also proper where a plaintiff asserts a “non-frivolous claim of a right or remedy under a federal statute,” commonly referred to as “federal question” jurisdiction. [Nw. S. Dakota Prod. Credit Ass’n v. Smith, 784 F.2d 323, 325 \(8th Cir. 1986\)](#). Stack does not set forth any allegations that could be liberally construed to violate a constitutional right or any federal statute. [Keeper v. King, 130 F.3d 1309, 1314 \(8th Cir. 1997\)](#). In short, Stack does not allege that Defendants deprived him of a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States or that the alleged deprivation was committed under “color of state law.” [West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48 \(1988\)](#); [Buckley v. Barlow, 997 F.2d 494, 495 \(8th Cir. 1993\)](#). Rather, Stack asserts claims, and seeks relief, pursuant to state law, such as claims for negligence. Accordingly, the court lacks subject matter jurisdiction.

However, on the court’s own motion, Stack shall have until March 30, 2012, to file a second amended complaint. His second amended complaint shall restate the allegations

of his Amended Complaint (Filing No. [35](#)) and any new allegations. Failure to consolidate all claims into one document will result in the abandonment of claims. If Stack fails to file a second amended complaint, the court will dismiss this matter for failure to prosecute diligently and failure to comply with court orders.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Stack's Motion to Amend Complaint (Filing No. [35](#)) is granted;
2. Stack's Amended Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted;
3. Stack shall have until **March 30, 2012**, to file a second amended complaint that sufficiently establishes this court's subject matter jurisdiction. If Stack fails to file a second amended complaint, this matter will be dismissed for failure to prosecute diligently and failure to comply with court orders;
4. In the event that Stack files a second amended complaint, he shall restate the allegations of his amended complaint (Filing No. [35](#)) and any new allegations. Failure to consolidate all claims into one document will result in the abandonment of claims; and
5. The Clerk of the court is directed to set a pro se case management deadline in this case using the following text: Review amended complaint on **March 30, 2012**; dismiss if not filed.

DATED this 15<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

s/Laurie Smith Camp  
Chief United States District Judge

---

\*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.