

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Roseline Pierre Blanc v. LVNV Funding LLC and Messerli & Kramer, P.A.

Blanc · No. 25-cv-2171 (ECT/SGE) · Decided January 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Minnesota considers defendants’ Rule 12(b)(6) motion in a pro se action arising from a prior Hennepin County Conciliation Court debt-collection judgment. The court holds that the Rooker-Feldman doctrine bars only the plaintiff’s request to vacate the state-court judgment, while the remaining claims are not subject to dismissal at this stage based on claim preclusion or sovereign-citizen arguments. The motion to dismiss is therefore granted in part and denied in part.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the District of Minnesota                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Eric C. Tostrud                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the District of Minnesota                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| DECIDED               | January 5, 2026                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| DOCKET                | 25-cv-2171 (ECT/SGE)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Defendants moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) to dismiss the pro se plaintiff's claims arising from defendants' prosecution of a prior state conciliation-court debt-collection action. The court granted the motion in part as to the request to vacate the state-court judgment and denied it in all other respects.                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts the complaint's factual allegations as true, draws reasonable inferences in the plaintiff's favor, and determines whether the complaint states a facially plausible claim for relief. The court may consider materials embraced by the pleadings, matters incorporated by reference, judicially noticeable matters, and public records. Because the plaintiff was pro se, the complaint was construed liberally, but she was not excused from complying with substantive and procedural law. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | unpublished district court opinion                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |

## TOPICS

motions to dismiss

subject matter jurisdiction

res judicata

fair debt collection

civil procedure

## PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

consumer protection

fair debt collection

constitutional law

torts

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Rooker-Feldman doctrine deprived the federal district court of subject-matter jurisdiction over Blanc's claims arising from defendants' conduct in the state-court debt-collection proceeding.
2. Whether the Rooker-Feldman doctrine barred Blanc's request to vacate the state conciliation-court judgment.
3. Whether Minnesota claim-preclusion principles supported dismissal of Blanc's claims at the Rule 12(b)(6) stage.
4. Whether Messerli & Kramer was in privity with LVNV for purposes of claim preclusion.
5. Whether the sovereign-citizen character of some of Blanc's filings justified dismissal of the complaint.

## HOLDINGS

1. Rooker-Feldman did not bar jurisdiction over Blanc's claims seeking relief for defendants' allegedly unlawful conduct in bringing and prosecuting the state-court case, because those claims were independent of the state-court judgment and sought damages for defendants' conduct rather than appellate review of the judgment.
2. The federal district court lacked subject-matter jurisdiction over Blanc's request to vacate the state-court judgment, and that portion of the complaint was dismissed without prejudice.
3. Claim preclusion did not support dismissal at the Rule 12(b)(6) stage because the extent of overlap between the operative facts underlying Blanc's state-court counterclaim and her federal claims was not apparent from the face of the complaint and embraced public records.
4. The attorney-client relationship between Messerli & Kramer and LVNV, without more, did not establish privity for claim-preclusion purposes, and the record did not show that Messerli had an interest in the state proceeding beyond obtaining a favorable outcome for LVNV.
5. The complaint was not dismissed merely because Blanc's filings reflected sovereign-citizen beliefs, because the complaint did not appear to be derived primarily from that ideology.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“The Rooker-Feldman doctrine requires dismissal of Ms. Blanc’s request to “vacate” the conciliation court’s judgment, but nothing else.”*

*“If a federal plaintiff asserts as a legal wrong an allegedly erroneous decision by a state court, and seeks relief from a state court judgment based on that decision, Rooker-Feldman bars subject matter jurisdiction in federal district court.”*

*“If, on the other hand, a federal plaintiff asserts as a legal wrong an allegedly illegal act or omission by an adverse party, Rooker-Feldman does not bar jurisdiction.”*

*“The Complaint will be dismissed without prejudice for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction to the extent it seeks this remedy.”*

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

LVNV and Messerli & Kramer attempted to collect an alleged \$1,119 debt originally issued by Credit One Bank and allegedly transferred through Sherman Originator III, LLC to LVNV. LVNV sued Blanc in Hennepin County Conciliation Court, seeking the debt, fees, and costs; Blanc counterclaimed, challenging the debt, its amount, and LVNV's ownership. After a remote hearing, the conciliation court entered judgment for LVNV in the amount of \$1,194.16, rejected Blanc's counterclaim, and Blanc did not appeal.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

LVNV Funding LLC, represented by Messerli & Kramer, obtained a \$1,194.16 judgment against Blanc in Hennepin County Conciliation Court after Blanc counterclaimed and challenged the debt and LVNV's ownership. Blanc did not appeal the state-court judgment, which was docketed on June 10, 2025, and filed this federal action on May 20, 2025. Defendants moved to dismiss, asserting Rooker-Feldman, claim preclusion, and sovereign-citizen grounds.

## DISPOSITION

other

## CASES CITED

- Gorog v. Best Buy Co., 760 F.3d 787, 792 (8th Cir. 2014)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Hager v. Arkansas Department of Health, 735 F.3d 1009, 1013 (8th Cir. 2013)
- Zean v. Fairview Health Services, 858 F.3d 520, 526 (8th Cir. 2017)
- Enervations, Inc. v. Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., 380 F.3d 1066, 1069 (8th Cir. 2004)
- Miller v. Redwood Toxicology Laboratory, Inc., 688 F.3d 928, 931 n.3 (8th Cir. 2012)
- Fredin v. Miller, No. 19-cv-3051 (SRN/HB), 2020 WL 3077708, at \*5 (D. Minn. June 10, 2020)
- Leonardo v. MSW Capital, LLC, No. 16-cv-3845 (PAM/FLN), 2017 WL 2062852, at \*2 (D. Minn. May 12, 2017)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (per curiam)
- Jackson v. Nixon, 747 F.3d 537, 541 (8th Cir. 2014)
- Solomon v. Petray, 795 F.3d 777, 787 (8th Cir. 2015)
- Stone v. Harry, 364 F.3d 912, 914-15 (8th Cir. 2004)
- Burgs v. Sissel, 745 F.2d 526, 528 (8th Cir. 1984)

- Sorenson v. Minnesota Department of Corrections, No. 12-cv-1336 (ADM/AJB), 2012 WL 3143927, at \*2 (D. Minn. Aug. 2, 2012)
- Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co., 263 U.S. 413 (1923)
- District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462 (1983)
- In re Athens/Alpha Gas Corp., 715 F.3d 230, 234 (8th Cir. 2013)
- Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp., 544 U.S. 280, 283-84, 291-93 (2005)
- GASH Associates v. Village of Rosemont, 995 F.2d 726, 728 (7th Cir. 1993)
- Hageman v. Barton, 817 F.3d 611, 614-15 (8th Cir. 2016)
- MSK EyEs Ltd. v. Wells Fargo Bank, National Association, 546 F.3d 533, 539 (8th Cir. 2008)
- Riehm v. Engelking, 538 F.3d 952, 965 (8th Cir. 2008)
- McCormick v. Braverman, 451 F.3d 382, 392 (6th Cir. 2006)
- Kvalvog v. Park Christian School, 66 F.4th 1147, 1151-52 (8th Cir. 2023)
- Jones v. Minnesota, No. 11-cv-2501 (JNE/AJB), 2011 WL 4947647, at \*6 (D. Minn. Sept. 28, 2011)
- Sternberg v. Warneck, No. 2:23-cv-01466-APG-EJY, 2024 WL 4805021, at \*1 (D. Nev. Nov. 14, 2024)
- Ashanti v. City of Golden Valley, 666 F.3d 1148, 1151 (8th Cir. 2012)
- Laase v. County of Isanti, 638 F.3d 853, 856 (8th Cir. 2011)
- Livingston v. ITT Consumer Financial Corp., 795 F. Supp. 921, 924 (D. Minn. 1992)
- Mattsen v. Packman, 358 N.W.2d 48 (Minn. 1984)
- St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Co. v. Compaq Computer Corp., 539 F.3d 809, 821 (8th Cir. 2008)
- Johnson v. Consolidated Freightways, Inc., 420 N.W.2d 608, 613-14 (Minn. 1988)
- C.H. Robinson Worldwide, Inc. v. Lobrano, 695 F.3d 758, 764 (8th Cir. 2012)
- Noble Systems Corp. v. Alorica Central, LLC, 543 F.3d 978, 983 (8th Cir. 2008)
- Margo-Kraft Distributors, Inc. v. Minneapolis Gas Co., 200 N.W.2d 45, 47-48 (Minn. 1972)
- Rucker v. Schmidt, 794 N.W.2d 114, 118-19 (Minn. 2011)
- Hentschel v. Smith, 153 N.W.2d 199, 206 (Minn. 1967)
- McMenomy v. Ryden, 148 N.W.2d 804, 807 (Minn. 1967)
- Worley v. Engel, No. 17-cv-1105 (PAM/SER), 2017 WL 4862766, at \*3 (D. Minn. Oct. 26, 2017)
- Delgado v. Midland Credit Management, Inc., No. 23-cv-2128 (ECT/JFD), 2024 WL 1255490, at \*11 (D. Minn. Mar. 25, 2024)
- Fairbairn v. Kodi Acquisitions LLC, No. 14-cv-1635 (PAM/JJK), 2014 WL 4954698, at \*3 (D. Minn. Oct. 2, 2014)
- Baalim v. United States, No. 4:19-cv-02671-HEA, 2020 WL 674004, at \*2 (E.D. Mo. Feb. 11, 2020)
- Hopper v. Addams, No. 2:24-cv-02129-TLB, 2024 WL 4730595, at \*2 (W.D. Ark. Oct. 21, 2024)
- Mills v. City of St. Louis, No. 4:25-cv-1219-MTS, 2025 WL 3470293, at \*2 n.3 (E.D. Mo. Dec. 3, 2025)