

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
OHIO, EASTERN DIVISION

Ahmad Hosseinipour v. Attorney Andrew Neuhauser, et al.

Hosseinipour · No. 5:25-cv-1888 · Decided January 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio dismissed Ahmad Hosseinipour’s pro se civil action against attorney Andrew Neuhauser and Luis Myrie for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. The court found no valid basis for federal-question jurisdiction and concluded that diversity jurisdiction was unavailable because the parties were Ohio citizens and the amount in controversy was \$6,000. The court denied the plaintiff’s motion for appointment of counsel as moot and certified that an appeal could not be taken in good faith.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Benita Y. Pearson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
DECIDED	January 2, 2026
DOCKET	5:25-cv-1888
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed an in forma pauperis civil complaint seeking \$6,000. Defendant Neuhauser moved to dismiss under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6). The district court dismissed the action for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and denied Plaintiff’s motion for appointment of counsel as moot.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court independently considered subject-matter jurisdiction, including sua sponte, and applied the requirement that an action be dismissed whenever the court determines that subject-matter jurisdiction is lacking.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court memorandum of opinion and order with no reporter or precedential designation identified.

PARTIES

Ahmad Hosseinipour v. Attorney Andrew Neuhauser, Luis Myrie

TOPICS

subject matter jurisdiction

motions to dismiss

pleadings

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

federal jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint established federal-question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
2. Whether the complaint established diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332.
3. Whether the action had to be dismissed for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3).

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint did not establish federal-question jurisdiction because it identified no specific provision of the United States Constitution or federal law that supplied a basis for the claim.
2. The complaint did not establish diversity jurisdiction because Plaintiff and Defendants were alleged to be Ohio citizens and the amount sought was only \$6,000, below the \$75,000 jurisdictional threshold.
3. The action had to be dismissed for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction and, even without a motion to dismiss, “have a duty to consider their subject matter jurisdiction in regard to every case and may raise the issue sua sponte.”” (2)

“If the court determines at any time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the court must dismiss the action.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, alleged that Defendants violated unspecified "federal government law," apparently because Defendant Andrew Neuhauser, a legal-aid attorney, represented Luis Myrie in a case against Plaintiff in the Mahoning County Court of Common Pleas. Plaintiff asserted that a community legal-aid attorney could not have a private client and sought \$6,000 in relief. The complaint and later filings identified no specific federal constitutional provision, statute, or other federal law supporting the action.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Hosseinipour filed a complaint against Andrew Neuhauser and Luis Myrie based on Neuhauser's representation of Myrie in ongoing litigation in the Mahoning County Court of Common Pleas. Neuhauser moved to dismiss,

arguing that the complaint identified no federal claim and that federal jurisdiction was unavailable. The district court dismissed under Rule 12(h)(3), denied appointment of counsel as moot, and certified that an appeal could not be taken in good faith.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Answers in Genesis of Ky., Inc. v. Creation Ministries Int'l, Ltd.*, 556 F.3d 459, 465 (6th Cir. 2009)
- *Mich. S. R.R. Co. v. Branch & St. Joseph Counties Rail Users Ass'n, Inc.*, 287 F.3d 568, 573 (6th Cir. 2002)
- *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 561 (1992)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-oh/2026/ahmad-hosseini-pour-v-attorney-andrew-neuhauser-et-al-kpnl-tifa>