

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE  
ASSOCIATION,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MICHAEL MATULKA, individually and  
as Personal Representative of the Estate of  
Bonnie Matulka; ESTATE OF BONNIE  
MATULKA, J. DOE, real name unknown,  
parties in possession, any and all other  
persons, partnerships, corporations or  
entities of every type, kind, and description  
whatsoever unknown, claiming any right,  
title, estate, interest, equity, or lien  
whatsoever in and to;

Defendants.

**4:13CV3049; 4:13CV3051;  
4:13CV3052; and 4:13CV3053**

**ORDER**

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE  
ASSOCIATION,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ROBERT T. MADEJ, BENTON STREET  
MINISTRIES, MICHAEL J. MATULKA,  
J. DOE, real name unknown, parties in  
possession, any and all other persons,  
partnerships, corporations or entities of  
every type, kind, and description  
whatsoever unknown, claiming any right,  
title, estate, interest, equity, or lien  
whatsoever in and to; and J. DOE, real  
name unknown, parties in possession, any  
and all other persons, partnerships,  
corporations or entities of every type, kind,  
and description whatsoever unknown,  
claiming any right, title, estate, interest,  
equity, or lien whatsoever in and to;

Defendants.

**4:13CV3050 and 4:13CV3054**

**ORDER**

With the exception of case no. 4:13cv3049, the above captioned cases were removed to this court on March 11, 2013. Case no. 4:13cv3049 was removed on March 19, 2013. Although the plaintiff has not filed a motion to remand, the court must review subject matter jurisdiction *sua sponte*. See Bueford v. Resolution Trust Corp., 991 F.2d 481, 485 (8th Cir. 1993); Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). The undersigned magistrate questions whether federal subject matter jurisdiction exists over these cases.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED:

1) The parties shall brief the issue of whether this court has federal subject matter jurisdiction over the above-captioned cases. The parties will brief the matter simultaneously, with the opening briefs to be filed on or before May 17, 2013, and any responsive briefs filed on or before May 31, 2013. No reply briefs will be allowed absent leave of the court.

2) On or before May 10, 2013, the parties shall show cause why the above-captioned cases should not be consolidated for the purposes of pretrial motion practice and discovery, in the absence of which the cases will be consolidated for those purposes.

Dated this 1st day of May, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Cheryl R. Zwart  
United States Magistrate Judge