

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

Latisa Cristine Micheaux, et al. v. American Credit Acceptance, et al.

Case No. 24-1102-DDC-BGS (D. Kan. Jan. 27, 2026) · No. 24-1102-DDC-BGS · Decided January 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Kansas overruled plaintiffs’ objection seeking to vacate an order compelling arbitration, concluding that the court had federal-question jurisdiction based on the amended complaint’s federal claims. The court denied as moot plaintiffs’ request for a ruling, warned that future frivolous filings could be summarily denied, and continued the administrative closure of the case pending arbitration.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the District of Kansas                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Daniel D. Crabtree                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the District of Kansas                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| DECIDED               | January 27, 2026                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| DOCKET                | 24-1102-DDC-BGS                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Plaintiffs objected to the court's prior order compelling the case to proceed in arbitration and sought to vacate that order, arguing that the court lacked subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiffs also filed a request demanding a ruling on their objection. The district court overruled the objection, denied the request as moot, and left the case administratively closed pending arbitration. |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | The court reviewed plaintiffs' objection to its prior order and independently considered whether subject matter jurisdiction existed based on the allegations of the Amended Complaint.                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | unpublished district court memorandum and order                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- arbitration
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court had federal-question subject matter jurisdiction based on plaintiffs' Amended Complaint alleging violations of federal law.
2. Whether plaintiffs' objection to the prior arbitration order should be sustained or that order vacated for lack of jurisdiction.
3. Whether plaintiffs' request for an immediate ruling should be denied as moot after the court ruled on the objection.

## HOLDINGS

1. The district court had federal-question jurisdiction because plaintiffs' Amended Complaint alleged violations of federal law, even though the pleading did not adequately establish diversity jurisdiction.
2. The objection to the prior order compelling arbitration and staying and administratively closing the case was overruled because plaintiffs failed to establish that the court lacked jurisdiction or otherwise showed grounds to vacate the order.
3. Plaintiffs' request for a ruling on their objection was denied as moot because the court ruled on the objection in the memorandum and order.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“a federal court has a virtually unflagging obligation to assert jurisdiction where it has that authority.”*  
(Opinion text)

*“The court may deny summarily any future filings that fail to show good cause to reopen this case—after those arbitration proceedings conclude.”* (Opinion text)

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs filed an action alleging violations of federal law, including claims apparently invoking the Fair Credit Reporting Act, and asserted federal-question and diversity jurisdiction. The Amended Complaint did not provide sufficient information to establish diversity jurisdiction, but it alleged federal-law violations. The court had previously compelled arbitration and stayed and administratively closed the case pending arbitration.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court previously ordered the parties to arbitrate and stayed and administratively closed the case pending the result of arbitration. Plaintiffs then filed an objection and demand to vacate that order, followed by a verified judicial notice and command for ruling. The court rejected the jurisdictional objection, held the request for a ruling moot because the court had ruled on the objection, and continued the administrative closure pending arbitration.

## DISPOSITION

other

#### CASES CITED

- Hall v. Bellmon, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991)
- Mata v. Lynch, 576 U.S. 143, 144 (2015)

---

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-kansas/2026/latisa-cristine-micheaux-et-al-v-american-credit-acceptance-f19uerc0>