

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA

Lewis v. Indiana National Guard

No. 1:26-cv-00592-JRO-MG (S.D. Ind. Apr. 3, 2026) · No. 1:26-cv-00592-JRO-MG · Decided April 3, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana grants Jahlil J. Lewis’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis. The court dismisses his complaint against the Indiana National Guard without prejudice as factually frivolous and for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction, while ordering him to show cause by April 23, 2026, why final judgment should not issue and warning of possible filing restrictions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Justin R. Olson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana
DECIDED	April 3, 2026
DOCKET	1:26-cv-00592-JRO-MG
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court granted Plaintiff leave to proceed in forma pauperis and screened his complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). The court dismissed the complaint without prejudice as factually frivolous for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and ordered Plaintiff to show cause why final judgment should not issue.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); the court must dismiss an in forma pauperis complaint that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Jahlil J. Lewis v. Indiana National Guard

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

federal civil procedure

in forma pauperis proceedings

subject-matter jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff qualified to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1).
2. Whether the complaint was subject to dismissal at screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) because its allegations were factually frivolous.
3. Whether a factually frivolous complaint invokes federal subject-matter jurisdiction and, if not, whether dismissal should be without prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis was granted because his submission met the statutory standard for demonstrating an inability to prepay the filing fee.
2. The complaint was factually frivolous and subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) because its allegations were delusional and rose to the level of the irrational or wholly incredible.
3. Because the complaint was factually frivolous, it did not invoke federal subject-matter jurisdiction, and dismissal was necessarily without prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Respectfully, Plaintiff’s factual allegations are not merely “unlikely” or “improbable” but fit the category of delusions.” (III. DISCUSSION)

“His complaint, dkt. [1], is factually frivolous and therefore DISMISSED without prejudice for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction.” (IV. CONCLUSION)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that various groups and law-enforcement personnel had been getting into his head, drugging him, sexually assaulting him while he slept, and using an algorithm or puppeteers to control his body. He also alleged related experiences involving mental-health hospitals, emergency rooms, medication side effects, loss of gun rights, and communications with the FBI and Indiana National Guard. The court found that these allegations were delusional and factually frivolous.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Lewis filed a pro se civil-rights complaint against the Indiana National Guard and moved to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court granted in forma pauperis status, screened the complaint, determined that the allegations were factually frivolous and did not invoke subject-matter jurisdiction, dismissed the complaint without prejudice, and allowed Plaintiff until April 23, 2026, to show cause why final judgment should not be entered.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Robbins v. Switzer, 104 F.3d 895, 898 (7th Cir. 1997)
- Arnett v. Webster, 658 F.3d 742, 751 (7th Cir. 2011)
- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989)
- Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992)
- Gladney v. Pendleton Corr. Facility, 302 F.3d 773, 774 (7th Cir. 2002)
- Lewis v. Smith, 1:26-cv-00498-JRO-MKK, Dkt. 7 (S.D. Ind. Mar. 23, 2026)
- Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env't, 523 U.S. 83, 89 (1998)
- Lauderdale-El v. Ind. Parole Bd., 35 F.4th 572, 576 (7th Cir. 2022)
- Montgomery v. Davis, 362 F.3d 956, 957 (7th Cir. 2004)
- In re McDonald, 489 U.S. 180, 184 (1989)
- Support Sys. Int'l v. Mack, 45 F.3d 185, 186 (7th Cir. 1995)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-indiana-united-states-district-court-for-t/2026/lewis-v-indiana-national-guard-qeng8s7k>