

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Wayne, Jr. v. Four Coasian Male Suspects, et al.

Wayne · No. 1:25-cv-03565 (UNA) · Decided January 2, 2026

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JESUS A. WAYNE, JR.,)) Plaintiff,)) v.) Civil Action No. 1:25-cv-03565 (UNA))) FOUR COASIAN) MALE SUSPECTS, et al.,)) Defendants.) MEMORANDUM OPINION This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's pro se complaint ("Compl."), ECF No. 1, and Application for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis, ECF No. 2.

The Court grants Plaintiff's IFP Application, and for the reasons explained below, it dismisses this matter for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The subject-matter jurisdiction of the federal district courts is limited and is set forth generally at 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1332.

Under those statutes, federal jurisdiction is available only when a "federal question" is presented, *id.* § 1331, or the parties are of diverse citizenship and the amount in controversy "exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs," *id.* § 1332(a). A party seeking relief in the district court must at least plead facts that bring the suit within the court's jurisdiction.

See Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Failure to plead such facts warrants dismissal of the action. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). Plaintiff, who resides in the District of Columbia, sues four unnamed individual defendants. See Compl. at 1–2. He does not provide addresses for these Defendants, stating only that they are all located somewhere in Virginia. See *id.* at 2. Plaintiff's failure to provide full names and addresses for the Defendants contravenes D.C.

LCvR 5.1(c)(1). The allegations themselves are spare: Plaintiff alleges only that, on October 4, 2025, Defendants trespassed at his property, and he provides certain identifying information for their purported vehicles. See *id.* at 4. Plaintiff does not plead for any relief, stating "no relief, no lawsuit." See *id.* Plaintiff has failed to establish subject matter jurisdiction.

First, he has failed to state a federal question. See 28 U.S.C. § 1331. He does not invoke any authority that provides a federal cause of action, nor can the Court independently discern any basis for federal question jurisdiction from the facts given in the complaint. See *Johnson v. Robinson*, 576 F.3d 522, 522 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (*per curiam*) ("[F]ederal court jurisdiction must affirmatively appear clearly and distinctly.") (quoting *Bilal v. Kaplan*, 904 F.2d 14, 15 (8th Cir.1990) (*per curiam*)).

Second, Plaintiff has failed to establish diversity jurisdiction. See 28 U.S.C. § 1332. It is a “well-established rule” that the diverse citizenship requirement be “assessed at the time the suit is filed.” *Freeport-McMoRan, Inc. v. K N Energy, Inc.*, 498 U.S. 426, 428 (1991).

Therefore, “the citizenship of every party to the action must be distinctly alleged [in the complaint] and cannot be established presumptively or by mere inference,” *Meng v. Schwartz*, 305 F. Supp. 2d 49, 55 (D.D.C. 2004), and an “allegation of residence alone is insufficient to establish the citizenship necessary for diversity jurisdiction,” *Novak v. Capital Mgmt. & Dev.*

Corp., 452 F.3d 902, 906 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (quoting *Naartex Consulting Corp. v. Watt*, 722 F.2d 779, 792 n.20 (D.C. Cir. 1983)). Here, Plaintiff has failed to sufficiently allege the residences of the Defendants, let alone their respective domiciles or citizenships.

Moreover, Plaintiff has not demanded any damages, let alone alleged that the amount in controversy plausibly exceeds \$75,000. Consequently, this case is dismissed without prejudice. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). A separate Order will issue contemporaneously. Date: January 2, 2026 /s/_____ ANA C. REYES United States District Judge