

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

LAURENCE KOFFI ADJORLOLO,

Petitioner,

v.

AMELIE ANNE ADJORLOLO
and BUREAU OF CHILD SUPPORT,

Respondents.

ORDER

03-C-0161-C

This is a civil action for injunctive relief in which petitioner Laurence Koffi Adjorlolo asks that respondent Amelie Anne Adjorlolo “sign for the divorce” and respondent Bureau of Child Support “fix the mistake that they made.” (It is unclear from the complaint what “mistake” respondent Bureau of Child support allegedly made.)

Petitioner is self-employed and earns \$700 a month. Although petitioner also has been employed with day jobs at Labor Ready since March 2003, he has not disclosed his earnings from those jobs. Nevertheless, I will assume for the purpose of reviewing his complaint that he is financially eligible to proceed to a review of the complaint without prepaying the filing fee.

From a review of petitioner's complaint, I conclude that this court does not have jurisdiction to hear petitioner's complaint regarding his divorce and child support payments. Federal courts can hear only those cases that Congress empowers them to hear. Generally, those fall into two categories: (1) cases in which the petitioner alleges a violation of his or her constitutional rights or rights established under federal law; and (2) cases in which a citizen of one state alleges a violation of his or her rights established under state law by a citizen of another state and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. See 28 U.S.C. § 1331-32. Petitioner's claims surrounding his divorce or child support do not fall into either category. At most they are state law claims. Petitioner does not allege any amount in controversy and all parties are citizens of Wisconsin.

It is true that a federal court may sometimes exercise jurisdiction over state law claims when they are brought in the same case as related federal claims. See United Mine Workers of America v. Gibbs, 383 U.S. 715 (1966). Such supplemental jurisdiction exists when a plaintiff brings both federal and related state claims against the same defendant in federal court and there is no independent basis for jurisdiction over the state claims. In this case, petitioner has not alleged any federal claim and I am aware of none. Because this court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over petitioner's claims surrounding his divorce decree and child support payments, I must dismiss his action.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that

1. Petitioner Laurence Koffi Adjorlolo is GRANTED leave to proceed without prepayment of the filing fee;
2. Petitioner's action against respondents Amelie Anne Adjorlolo and Bureau of Child Support is DISMISSED for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; and
3. The clerk of court is directed to close the file.

Entered this 17th day of April, 2003.

BY THE COURT:

BARBARA B. CRABB
District Judge