

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA

Connie Norris v. Magnolia Water Utilities Operating Company, LLC,
et al.

Civil Action No. 26-163, Section I · No. Civil Action No. 26-163, Section I · Decided June 8, 2026

SUMMARY

This Order and Reasons addresses motions to dismiss claims brought by pro se plaintiff Connie Norris concerning allegedly contaminated water, water utility regulation, and participation in Louisiana Public Service Commission proceedings. The court dismisses the Safe Drinking Water Act claim without prejudice for failure to satisfy the statutory 60-day presuit notice requirement and discusses jurisdictional issues involving rate-related claims and personal jurisdiction over Central States Water Resources, Inc. The excerpt ends during the court’s personal-jurisdiction analysis.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Lance M. Africk
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
DECIDED	June 8, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 26-163, Section I
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff proceeded pro se against private water-utility entities, their alleged parent company, and public regulators. Central States Water Resources, Inc. moved to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2). The Magnolia Water defendants moved to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(1), failure to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6), and to stay remaining claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For Rule 12(b)(1), the court determines whether it has statutory or constitutional power to adjudicate the claims, with the jurisdictional burden on the party asserting jurisdiction. For Rule 12(b)(2), the plaintiff must make a prima facie showing of personal jurisdiction, and uncontroverted allegations are accepted as true while controverted allegations are resolved in the plaintiff’s favor. For Rule 12(b)(6), the

	complaint must contain sufficient factual matter to state a plausible claim, with well-pleaded allegations viewed in the plaintiff's favor.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished federal district court order; precedential status unknown
PARTIES	Connie Norris v. Magnolia Water Utilities Operating Company, LLC, Magnolia Water Services Group, LLC, Magnolia Water Holding Company, LLC, Louisiana Central States Water, LLC, Central States Water Resources, Inc., Louisiana Public Service Commission

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

personal jurisdiction

subject matter jurisdiction

due process

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

environmental law

administrative law

constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court had personal jurisdiction over Central States Water Resources, Inc. based on its alleged contacts with Louisiana or its relationship with the Magnolia Water defendants.
2. Whether plaintiff's Safe Drinking Water Act claim was barred for failure to provide the required sixty-day presuit notice.
3. Whether plaintiff abandoned or failed to state claims for rate-related relief, procedural due process, arbitrary and capricious agency action, failure to protect public health, violations of Louisiana sanitary-law provisions, and unjust enrichment.
4. Whether the court should decline supplemental jurisdiction over plaintiff's remaining state-law negligence and gross-negligence claims.

HOLDINGS

1. The court lacked personal jurisdiction over Central States Water Resources, Inc. because plaintiff did not present sufficient uncontroverted allegations or evidence to overcome the presumption of corporate separateness and establish that CSWR was the alter ego of the Magnolia Water defendants.
2. Plaintiff's Safe Drinking Water Act claim had to be dismissed without prejudice because she failed to provide the statutorily required sixty-day presuit notice.
3. Plaintiff failed to state a procedural due process claim against the Magnolia Water defendants because she did not allege conduct attributable to the defendants that constituted state action.
4. Plaintiff's unjust-enrichment claim was dismissed because Louisiana law makes unjust enrichment a subsidiary remedy unavailable when another legal remedy, including her negligence claim, is available.
5. The court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claims because all claims supporting original federal jurisdiction had been dismissed and the state claims substantially predominated.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The fact that CSWR is the parent company to the Magnolia Water defendants, standing alone, is insufficient to establish personal jurisdiction over CSWR.” (III.b)

“Because plaintiff fails to allege conduct by the Magnolia Water defendants that constitutes “state action” which deprived her of her procedural due process rights, her procedural due process allegations fail to state a claim against Magolia.” (III.c.1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Connie Norris, a Louisiana resident and ratepayer, alleged that water supplied by Magnolia/CSWR was contaminated and unsafe, causing medical expenses and property damage. She also alleged that Magnolia abandoned and reconnected water systems, resulting in brown water, bacterial contamination, low pressure, and inadequate sanitary surveys. Norris further challenged her treatment in Louisiana Public Service Commission proceedings, alleging that evidence was excluded and the docket was closed without meaningful participation. CSWR denied having a Louisiana presence, but the record showed a parent-subsidary relationship with the Magnolia entities and some overlapping business activity.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court had previously denied plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order and dismissed the Louisiana Public Service Commission on Eleventh Amendment immunity grounds. In this order, the court dismissed plaintiff's claims against CSWR for lack of personal jurisdiction, dismissed the Safe Drinking Water Act claim without prejudice for failure to satisfy the statutory sixty-day notice requirement, dismissed several other claims under Rule 12(b)(6) or because they were abandoned, and declined supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claims. The Magnolia Water defendants' motion was granted in part and denied in part, and their motion to stay was denied as moot.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- In re FEMA Trailer Formaldehyde Prod. Liab. Litig., 668 F.3d 281, 286 (5th Cir. 2012)
- Ramming v. United States, 281 F.3d 158, 161 (5th Cir. 2001)
- McFadin v. Gerber, 587 F.3d 753, 759-60 (5th Cir. 2009)
- Companion Prop. & Cas. Ins. Co. v. Palermo, 723 F.3d 557, 559 (5th Cir. 2013)
- Guidry v. U.S. Tobacco Co., 188 F.3d 619, 624 (5th Cir. 1999)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 677-78 (2009)
- Hussey v. Total Env't Sols., Inc., 2015 WL 7282073, at *1-2 (W.D. La. Nov. 16, 2015)
- ACORN v. Edwards, 842 F. Supp. 227, 230 (E.D. La. 1993)
- McClelland v. Katy Indep. Sch. Dist., 63 F.4th 996, 1010 (5th Cir. 2023)

- Conti 11. Container Schiffarts-GMBH & Co. KG M.S., MSC Flaminia v. MSC Mediterranean Shipping Co. S.A., 91 F.4th 789, 800-01 (5th Cir. 2024)
- Diece-Lisa Indus., Inc. v. Disney Enters., Inc., 943 F.3d 239, 251-52 (5th Cir. 2019)
- Savoie v. Pritchard, 122 F.4th 185, 190 (5th Cir. 2024)
- Pearson v. Shriners Hosps. for Child., Inc., 133 F.4th 433, 443-44 (5th Cir. 2025)
- Reed v. Goertz, 598 U.S. 230, 236 (2023)
- Walters v. MedSouth Rec. Mgmt., LLC, 38 So. 3d 245, 246 (La. 2010)
- United Mine Workers of America v. Gibbs, 383 U.S. 715, 726-27 (1966)
- Manyweather v. Woodlawn Manor, Inc., 40 F.4th 237, 246 (5th Cir. 2022)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-lou/2026/connie-norris-v-magnolia-water-utilities-operating-company-gtt49mw0>