

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA, INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

**Ali Jabbari v. Parviz Omidvar, Oliver Omidvar, Lurie, Zepeda,
Schmalz, Hogan & Martin LLP, Steven P. Hogan, M. Damien
Holcomb, Rachel Kartin, Bodman PLC, Stephen P. Dunn, and John
Does 1-50**

Jabbari · No. 1:26-cv-00206-TWP-TAB · Decided February 11, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana sets briefing deadlines for Plaintiff Ali Jabbari's motion to remand and Defendants' motion to dismiss. The Court also orders the removing defendants to submit a supplemental jurisdictional statement addressing the citizenship of certain entities and the participation of other defendants in removal, and directs defense counsel to file an amended notice of appearance.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, Indianapolis Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Tanya Walton Pratt
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana
DECIDED	February 11, 2026
DOCKET	1:26-cv-00206-TWP-TAB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff initiated the action in Indiana state court. Two defendants removed it to federal court based on diversity jurisdiction. Plaintiff filed an emergency motion to remand, and the removing defendants filed a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and improper venue. The district court issued an order setting briefing schedules, requiring a supplemental jurisdictional statement, and directing defense counsel to amend his notice of appearance.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The federal court independently examines its subject-matter jurisdiction and requires the removing parties to establish the jurisdictional facts supporting removal.

TOPICS

subject matter jurisdiction

civil procedure

pleadings

personal jurisdiction

venue

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

federal jurisdiction

removal

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the amended notice of removal sufficiently alleged the citizenship of the unincorporated entities Hogan & Martin LLP and Bodman PLC to establish diversity jurisdiction.
2. Whether the removing defendants were required to explain the absence of other named defendants from the notice of removal and identify whether those defendants consented to or joined in removal.
3. What briefing and jurisdictional disclosures were required before the court could address the pending motion to remand and motion to dismiss.

HOLDINGS

1. The amended notice of removal was insufficient because it did not identify the partners or members of Hogan & Martin LLP and Bodman PLC and their citizenships, preventing the court from determining whether complete diversity existed.
2. The removing defendants were required to explain the absence of Hogan & Martin LLP, Steven Hogan, M. Damien Holcomb, Rachel Kartin, and Stephen Dunn from the amended notice of removal and state whether properly joined and served defendants consented to or joined in removal.
3. The court has an independent responsibility to ensure that subject-matter jurisdiction exists and cannot rely on the parties' agreement or stipulation that jurisdiction exists.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court is not being hyper-technical: Counsel has a professional obligation to analyze subject-matter jurisdiction, Heinen v. Northrop Grumman Corp., 671 F.3d 669, 670 (7th Cir. 2012), and a federal court always has a responsibility to ensure that it has jurisdiction, Hukic v. Aurora Loan Servs., 588 F.3d 420, 427 (7th Cir. 2009).” (Section II)

“The Court must know the details of the underlying jurisdictional allegations because parties cannot confer jurisdiction on the Court simply by stipulating that it exists.” (Section II)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jabbari, proceeding pro se, initiated the action in Indiana state court against multiple individual defendants, law firms, attorneys, and John Does. Parviz Omidvar and Oliver Omidvar removed the case on the basis of diversity jurisdiction, but their amended notice of removal did not adequately allege the citizenship of Hogan & Martin

LLP or Bodman PLC. The notice also did not explain whether several defendants had been properly joined and served or whether they consented to or joined in the removal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Ali Jabbari filed the action in Hamilton Circuit Court on January 7, 2026. Parviz Omidvar and Oliver Omidvar removed the action on January 30, 2026, and Jabbari filed an amended complaint and motion to remand. The court did not resolve the remand or dismissal motions in this order; instead, it set briefing deadlines, required additional jurisdictional allegations, and ordered an amended notice of appearance.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The court did not decide the motion to remand. It ordered the removing defendants to file a supplemental jurisdictional statement within fourteen days identifying the partners and members of Hogan & Martin LLP and Bodman PLC and their state citizenships, and explaining whether the other properly joined and served defendants consented to or joined in removal.

CASES CITED

- Meyerson v. Harrah's East Chi. Casino, 299 F.3d 616, 617 (7th Cir. 2002)
- Thomas v. Guardsmark, LLC, 487 F.3d 531, 534 (7th Cir. 2007)
- Am.'s Best Inns, Inc. v. Best Inns of Abilene, L.P., 980 F.2d 1072, 1073 (7th Cir. 1992)
- West v. Louisville Gas & Elec. Co., 951 F.3d 827, 830 (7th Cir. 2020)
- N. Ill. Gas Co. v. Airco Indus. Gases, a Div. of Airco, Inc., 676 F.2d 270, 273 (7th Cir. 1982)
- Heinen v. Northrop Grumman Corp., 671 F.3d 669, 670 (7th Cir. 2012)
- Hukic v. Aurora Loan Servs., 588 F.3d 420, 427 (7th Cir. 2009)
- Evergreen Square of Cudahy v. Wis. Hous. & Econ. Dev. Auth., 776 F.3d 463, 465 (7th Cir. 2015)
- Schur v. L.A. Weight Loss Ctrs., Inc., 577 F.3d 752, 758 (7th Cir. 2009)
- Doe v. Allied-Signal, Inc., 985 F.2d 908, 911 (7th Cir. 1993)