

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE**

Jeffery Dale Parker v. Winton Auction & Realty Co.

Case No. 1:26-cv-61 · No. 1:26-cv-61 · Decided May 5, 2026

OPINION

Parker

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT CHATTANOOGA

JEFFERY DALE PARKER,)

) Case No. 1:26-cv-61 Plaintiff,)) Judge Travis R. McDonough v.)) Magistrate Judge
Christopher H. Steger

WINTON AUCTION & REALTY CO.,)

) Defendant.)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Plaintiff Jeffery Dale Parker initiated this action against Defendant Winton Auction & Realty Co. (“Winton”) on March 9, 2026. (Doc. 1.) In his complaint, Parker asserting claims against Winton under Title 18, United States Code, Sections 241 and 242. (Id. at 1.) In support, Parker alleges, in totality, as follows: I Jeffery Dale Parker A living man on the land. I am filing this suit on behalf of the 30 acres tract Eldi Jean Taylor Parker estate which is a void judgment on the court of franklin county Marbury v. Madison anything repugnant to the constitution is null and void. Article VI paragraph 2 anything in constitution or laws of any state to the contrary not withstanding so anything they have done after they violate the constitution is void. Marriage license is violating the constitution Murdock v. Pennsylvania clearly no state may convert a secured liberty into a privilege and charge a fee thereof. this court has violated several constitutional amendments, and has yet to answer their authority. Jurisdiction over me as a living man they only can deal with dead entities. This realty co. has my home up for sale unlawfully against my consent. I will be asking for Two Million in Article 3 court, negligence professional malpractice, conversion, Trespass to land violation of Tennessee Protection Act 47-18-101 this property is registered to me and i will never sign off on it. I am asking for Article 3 Judge with trial by jury. Husband and wife are considered on person (as on flesh and blood) in law. Co. litt. 112 Jenk, Cent. 27. All things which are the wife’s are the husband’s fol. 32:2 Kent Comm. 130–143. An unconstitutional Act is not a law it confers no rights it imposes no duties it affords no protection, it creates no office, it is in legal contemplation as in operative as though it had never

been passed. *Norton v. Shelby County* 118 US 425, 442. A repugnant Act cannot be brought into being, void things are nothing. Mr. Clinton Swafford told me your company sells a lot of places for the court (Id. at 4–5.) Winton moved to dismiss Parker’s claims against it (Doc. 7), and Parker has not timely responded to the motion to dismiss. See E.D. Tenn. Local Rule 7.1(a) (providing that parties are required to file a response to a dispositive motion within twenty-one days). Based on the allegations in Parker’s complaint, the Court does not have subject-matter jurisdiction over this case. First, to the extent Parker seeks to assert claims under Title 18, United States Code, Sections 241 and 242, those statutes do not provide a private right of action. *United States v. Oguaju*, 76 F. App’x 579, 580 (6th Cir. 2003) (stating that these statutes, which are “directed to the criminal violation of civil rights, [do] not grant a blanket investigatory power to be invoked by a citizen.”). As a result, Parker’s complaint lacks a federal question that confers the Court with subject-matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331. To the extent Parker seeks to assert state-law causes of action against Winton, his complaint fails to allege that the parties are diverse as required to confer subject-matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. The caption on Parker’s complaint identifies his address as 916 Adams Dr., Shelbyville, TN 37160, and Winton’s address 116 1st Ave., SE, Winchester, TN 37398, indicating that both parties are residents of Tennessee. (See Doc. 1.) Parker’s complaint fails to include allegations demonstrating that the Court has subject-matter jurisdiction. Accordingly, the Court will DISMISS Parker’s claims against Winton WITHOUT PREJUDICE for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and will DENY AS MOOT Winton’s motion to dismiss (Doc. 7). AN APPROPRIATE JUDGMENT WILL ENTER. /s/ Travis R. McDonough
TRAVIS R. MCDONOUGH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE