

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF
MASSACHUSETTS

Johnson v. Abadi, et al.

Johnson v. Abadi · No. 25-13481-ADB · Decided April 1, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts dismisses a pro se action brought by Olivia Johnson against Gina Abadi and Hong Yi Zeng. The court concludes that the complaint fails to establish Article III standing because it does not identify conduct by the defendants that personally injured the plaintiff.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Allison D. Burroughs
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts
DECIDED	April 1, 2026
DOCKET	25-13481-ADB
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A pro se plaintiff filed a one-page civil complaint and a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court dismissed the action for lack of Article III standing.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the Article III standing requirement and dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction because the complaint failed to allege a concrete, particularized, and actual or imminent injury fairly traceable to defendants and redressable by a favorable ruling.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Olivia Johnson v. Gina Abadi, Hong Yi Zeng

TOPICS

- standing
- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- due process

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- constitutional law
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint alleged facts establishing Article III standing.
2. Whether the action should be dismissed for lack of a case or controversy and subject matter jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to establish Article III standing because Johnson did not identify conduct by the defendants that caused her a concrete, particularized, and actual or imminent injury.
2. Because Johnson did not allege standing, no case or controversy existed over which the district court could exercise jurisdiction, and the action was dismissed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“For a case or controversy to exist, the plaintiff must have standing, or, in other words, the plaintiff “must present an injury that is concrete, particularized, and actual or imminent; fairly traceable to the defendant’s challenged action; and redressable by a favorable ruling.””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Johnson filed a one-page complaint naming Gina Abadi and Hong Yi Zeng as defendants. The complaint alleged only that defendants conspired together in violation of due process rights, sought damages, and included jurisdictional and Rule 11 certifications; it did not identify any conduct that personally injured Johnson.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Johnson filed the action on November 20, 2025, alleging that defendants conspired to violate her due process rights and requesting damages. The district court determined that the complaint did not identify conduct by defendants that personally injured Johnson and dismissed the action for lack of a justiciable case or controversy.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Horne v. Flores*, 557 U.S. 433, 445 (2009)