

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, EASTERN DIVISION

Alexander v. Hill-Kearse, et al.

Alexander · No. 4:26-cv-0096-MTS · Decided March 3, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri sua sponte dismissed Joseph Alexander’s complaint without prejudice for failure to establish subject-matter jurisdiction. The court declined to permit amendment, citing the allegedly malicious filing of identical actions in other federal courts and the return of mail as undeliverable.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Matthew T. Schelp
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
DECIDED	March 3, 2026
DOCKET	4:26-cv-0096-MTS
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court sua sponte reviewed the complaint for subject-matter jurisdiction and dismissed the action without prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A federal court must dismiss an action whenever it determines that subject-matter jurisdiction is lacking.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court memorandum opinion
PARTIES	Joseph Alexander v. Dawn Hill-Kearse, et al.

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court had subject-matter jurisdiction over the action.
2. Whether the court should dismiss the action sua sponte without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3).
3. Whether Plaintiff should be given an opportunity to amend the complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. Because the complaint did not establish or seriously attempt to establish subject-matter jurisdiction, the court lacked jurisdiction over the action.
2. The action was dismissed without prejudice for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction.
3. The court declined to provide Plaintiff an opportunity to amend the complaint.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A review of the single-page Complaint filed in this action shows that Plaintiff has not established—or even seriously attempted to establish—this Court’s subject- matter jurisdiction.” (at 2)

“For that reason, the Court, sua sponte, will dismiss this action without prejudice.” (at 2)

“sua sponte dismissal is mandatory when a court discovers that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed a single-page complaint against Dawn Hill-Kearse and other defendants. The complaint did not establish, or seriously attempt to establish, the court’s subject-matter jurisdiction. The court also found that the action was identical to cases Plaintiff had filed in federal courts across the country and that mail sent to Plaintiff’s supplied address was returned as undeliverable.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a single-page complaint in the Eastern District of Missouri. The court concluded that the complaint did not establish or seriously attempt to establish subject-matter jurisdiction, and dismissed the action without prejudice without granting leave to amend.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Carver v. Atwood, 18 F.4th 494, 497 (5th Cir. 2021)
- Alexander v. Hill-Kearse, 3:26-cv-0057-WMC (W.D. Wis.)
- Alexander v. Hill-Kearse, 4:26-cv-0115-LPR (E.D. Ark.)
- Alexander v. Hill-Kearse, 5:26-cv-0035-CAR (M.D. Ga.)

- Alexander v. Hill-Kearse, 5:26-cv-0113-SLP, ECF No. 4 (W.D. Okla. Jan. 29, 2026)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION JOSEPH ALEXANDER,)) Plaintiff,)) vs.) Case No. 4:26-cv-0096-MTS) DAWN HILL-KEARSE, et al.,)) Defendants.) MEMORANDUM OPINION A review of the single-page Complaint filed in this action shows that Plaintiff has not established—or even seriously attempted to establish—this Court’s subject- matter jurisdiction.

For that reason, the Court, sua sponte, will dismiss this action without prejudice. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3); see also Carver v. Atwood, 18 F.4th 494, 497 (5th Cir. 2021) (“sua sponte dismissal is mandatory when a court discovers that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction”).

The Court will not provide an opportunity for Plaintiff to amend the Complaint for two reasons. First, this case is malicious in that it is identical to cases filed by this Plaintiff in United States District Courts across the Country.* Second, mail sent to the address Plaintiff provided this Court (and the other courts) comes back as undeliverable. * See, e.g., Alexander v. Hill-Kearse, 3:26-cv-0057-WMC (W.D.

Wis.); Alexander v. Hill- Kearse, 4:26-cv-0115-LPR (E.D. Ark.); Alexander v. Hill-Kearse, 5:26-cv-0035-CAR (M.D. Ga.). See also Alexander v. Hill-Kearse, 5:26-cv-0113-SLP, ECF No. 4 (W.D. Okla. Jan. 29, 2026) (sua sponte dismissing action for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction). An appropriate Order of Dismissal will be entered herewith. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 58(a).

Dated this 3rd day of March 2026. Th adrtneW T. SCHELP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
-2-