

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
TAMPA DIVISION

KARA NEUMILLER, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CASE NO. 8:24-cv-2988-SDM-LSG

JACOB NEUMILLER, et al.,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER**

An earlier order (Doc. 8) identifies several deficiencies in the complaint, dismisses this action without prejudice, and allows the plaintiffs to amend the complaint to state a claim. On February 27, 2025, and appearing *pro se*, the plaintiffs amended (Doc. 12) the complaint. The plaintiffs move (Doc. 16) to “submit [an] amended injunction,” move (Doc. 18) to “stop all court actions in Wyoming and to move to Florida courts,” and move (Doc. 22) for an “emergency protective order.” Without leave, the plaintiffs file (Docs. 17, 19) two amended complaints. Rule 15, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, requires that twenty-one days after filing a complaint, “a party may amend its pleading only with the opposing party’s written consent or the court’s leave.”

The amended complaint alleges crimes against children in Wyoming and, although not entirely clear, seems to request relief in a domestic relations action in Wyoming. Any evidence of a crime in Wyoming should be reported to local law


enforcement or the United States Attorney for the District of Wyoming (<https://www.justice.gov/usao-wy/contact-us>). A district court is without jurisdiction to intervene in a state domestic-relations action and is without authority to investigate ongoing crimes. Further, unless a criminal statute explicitly establishes a private right of action, the plaintiffs may not bring a civil action to enforce a criminal statute. The amended complaint fails to establish personal jurisdiction over the defendants, fails to establish that venue is proper in the Middle District of Florida, and fails to state a claim.

Barring a narrow set of exceptions (none of which applies here), a district court may not enjoin a domestic relations action or a criminal prosecution in state court. *Narciso v. Walker*, 811 F. App'x 600, 602 (11th Cir. 2020). The appellate courts in Wyoming are open and competent to review the plaintiffs' constitutional claims for the deprivation of due process in the state-court action. *Narciso*, 811 F. App'x at 602. Under the circumstances alleged in the complaint, no authority exists for a Florida district court to enjoin a Wyoming state-court action.

For these reasons and the reasons stated in the earlier order (Doc. 14), the motions (Docs. 16, 18, 21, 22) to move the Wyoming state-court action to Florida and to enjoin the Wyoming action are **DENIED**. This action is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. Because an attachment (Doc. 22-1) to the motion for a protective order includes the name of a minor child, the attachment (Doc. 22-1) is **STRICKEN**, and the clerk must delete the image (Doc. 22-1) from the docket. The clerk must

return to the plaintiffs each summons sent to the clerk, and the clerk must return to the plaintiffs each USB drive. The clerk must close the case.

ORDERED in Tampa, Florida, on April 15, 2025.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steven D. Merryday", written in a cursive style.

---

STEVEN D. MERRYDAY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE