

## Some subject-matter jurisdiction hypotheticals

$\pi$ , a citizen of Oregon, sues  $\partial$ , a citizen of Nevada for two claims: (1) discrimination in violation of federal law because  $\partial$  fired  $\pi$  and (2) breach of contract under state law relating to an unrelated agreement between  $\pi$  and  $\partial$ .  $\pi$  seeks \$50,000 on the first claim and \$100,000 on the second claim.

$\pi$ , a citizen of Oregon, sues  $\partial$ , a citizen of Nevada for two claims: (1) breach of contract under state law, leading to \$45,000 in damages and (2) an unrelated tort under state law, leading to \$50,000 in damages.

$\pi$ , a citizen of Oregon, sues  $\partial$ , a citizen of Oregon, for two claims: (1) copyright infringement under federal law, seeking \$100,000 and (2) conversion under state law for the same infringement, also seeking \$100,000.

$\pi$ , a citizen of Oregon, sues two  $\partial$ s, who are also citizens of Oregon. The two  $\partial$ s are properly joined under Rule 20.  $\pi$  alleges  $\partial$  1 violated a federal statute, and alleges that  $\partial$  2 violated a state statute.

Two  $\pi$ s sue a single  $\partial$  for violation of a state law.  $\pi$  1's claim is for \$200,000 in damages, and  $\pi$  2's claim is for \$75,000 in damages. The two claims are related to each other and so that is why the two  $\pi$ s can bring them in this single action. Assume  $\pi$  1 is a citizen of Oregon,  $\pi$  2 is a citizen of California, and  $\partial$  is a citizen of Washington.

$\pi$ , a citizen of Oregon, sues  $\partial$ , a citizen of Washington, for negligence under state law, seeking \$100,000.  $\partial$  brings a state-law based counterclaim against  $\pi$  that arises from the same transaction or occurrence, seeking \$80,000.

Same facts as above, except that the counterclaim seeks \$30,000.

$\pi$ , a citizen of Oregon, sues  $\partial$ , a citizen of Washington, for negligence under state law, seeking \$100,000.  $\partial$  brings a completely unrelated counterclaim against  $\pi$ , seeking \$76,000.

Same facts as above, except that the counterclaim seeks \$30,000.

$\pi$ , a citizen of Oregon, sues two  $\partial$ s, who are both citizens of Washington.  $\pi$  sues  $\partial$  1 for negligence under state law, seeking \$100,000 and sues  $\partial$  2 for negligence under state law, seeking \$150,000. The two claims all arise from a car accident that all three parties were involved in. Both  $\partial$ s bring counterclaims against the  $\pi$  for negligence under state law because they think the accident is the  $\pi$ 's fault. Each  $\partial$  seeks \$60,000 for their own injuries resulting from the accident.  $\partial$  1 also sues  $\partial$  2 for negligence under state law, this time seeking \$100,000 in damages (she seeks a bit more than the \$60,000 against the  $\pi$  because  $\partial$  1 thinks  $\partial$  2 should also pay punitive damages).  $\partial$  2 does not sue  $\partial$  1 because he doesn't think she was at fault.

$\pi$ , a citizen of Oregon, sues  $\partial$ , a citizen of Washington, for negligence under state law, seeking \$100,000.  $\partial$  believes that the product it purchased from a non-party was partially responsible for  $\pi$ 's injuries, and  $\partial$  therefore thinks it can seek contribution under state law to recover some of what it might have to pay to the  $\pi$  should the  $\partial$  lose the lawsuit. So  $\partial$  files a third-party complaint against the non-party, thereby making that non-party a third-party  $\partial$ . The claim is for contribution under state law, and seeks \$100,000.

Same facts as above, except the contribution claim seeks only \$30,000.

Same facts as above, except the  $\pi$ , after seeing the non-party named in the third-party complaint decides to sue that person as a  $\partial$  under state law, seeking \$30,000.