IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT JACKSON

JONATHAN PARDUE,	
Plaintiff,	
-vs-	
	Case No. _____
RICHARD CROSSNO, in his individual capacity, and the TOWN OF BRUCETON, TENNESSEE,	**JURY DEMAND**
Defendants.	

COMPLAINT

"It is axiomatic that the government may not regulate speech based on its substantive content or the message it conveys."

-- *Rosenberger v. Rector and Visitors of University of Virginia*, 515 U.S. 819, 828 (1995).

COMES NOW THE PLAINTIFF, JONATHAN PARDUE, and sues the Defendants, RICHARD CROSSNO and the TOWN OF BRUCETON, TENNESSEE, and would state as follows:

I.
Introduction

1. On the evening of November 11, 2025, Richard Crossno, the Chief of Police of the Town of Bruceton, Tennessee, while in a fit of rage, physically assaulted and then brutally and maliciously attacked the Plaintiff Jonathan Pardue in retaliation for his exercise of free speech during a meeting of the Mayor and Board of Aldermen. The Defendant's unprovoked assault and

battery upon the Plaintiff occurred in open public view on town-owned property outside of City Hall in Bruceton, Tennessee, and in the presence of the Defendant's subordinate police officers. At the time of his assault, the Plaintiff had not committed any crime, and his only "offense" was speaking out publicly on a matter of corrupt police practices and an elected Alderman's abuse of power.

2. The Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the Chief of Police Richard Crossno, in his individual capacity, acting under color of state law and pursuant to the policies, customs and usages of the Town of Bruceton, for excessive force in violation of the Plaintiff's constitutional rights as guaranteed by the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution. In addition, the Plaintiff sues the Defendant Town of Bruceton for violation of his right of freedom of expression as protected under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. The Plaintiff further sues the Defendant Richard Crossno for pendent state claims of assault and battery.

3. The Plaintiff further alleges that the Town of Bruceton failed to implement proper policies, procedures, and practices in its police department; that the Town of Bruceton failed to implement proper training, discipline, and supervision of its police officers; and that these failures directly caused the Plaintiff's injuries.

4. The Defendant Crossno, as the Chief of Police, occupies the position of policy maker, and as such, his actions, decisions and use of excessive force are

directly attributable to the Town of Bruceton. Plaintiff alleges that the actions of Chief of Police Richard Crossno were carried out with deliberate indifference and in careless disregard of the Plaintiff's clearly established constitutional rights.

5. The Plaintiff also sues the Town of Bruceton, Tennessee pursuant to 42 U.S.C.§ 1983, for municipal liability and violation of his civil and constitutional rights.

6. The Plaintiff seeks an award of compensatory damages arising out of his injuries and the deprivation of his constitutionally protected rights., together with attorney's fees as provided in 42 U.S.C. § 1988. The Plaintiff further seeks punitive damages against the Defendant Richard Crossno.

II.
Jurisdiction and Venue

7. Jurisdiction is vested in this Court pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 1331 because this case presents a federal question and causes of action.

8. Venue is proper in the Western District of Tennessee because all of the relevant facts giving rise to the causes of action stated herein occurred within Carrol County, Tennessee.

III.
Parties

9. The Plaintiff Jonathan Pardue is an adult citizen and resident of Bruceton, Tennessee.

10. The Defendant Richard Crossno is an adult citizen and resident of Carroll County, Tennessee. He is sued in his individual capacity. This Defendant may be served with process at 209 Cheatham Street, Bruceton, Tennessee 38317.

11. The Defendant Town of Bruceton, Tennessee is a body politic and an incorporated municipality created under the laws of the State of Tennessee. This Defendant may be served in care of its presiding Mayor and Chief Executive, Robert Keeton, III at 209 Cheatham Street, Bruceton, Tennessee 38317.

IV.
Facts

12. Jonathan Pardue is a volunteer first responder with the Town of Bruceton, Tennessee. He resides with two children at 165 Lexington Street, Bruceton, Tennessee 38317.

13. The property where the Plaintiff resides lies adjacent to certain residential property owned and occupied by Renee Ford-Ward, an elected Alderman with the Town of Bruceton, Tennessee.

14. Beginning in 2022, the Plaintiff became the target of persistent and repeated threats, intimidation and harassment by his neighbor, Alderman Ford-Ward. Specifically, Mrs. Ford-Ward imperiously sought to assert her political influence as an Alderman by threatening to have the Town fine Mr. Pardue for failing to properly maintain his pets and livestock; she repeatedly trespassed on to the Plaintiff's land, accusing him of failing to maintain his

fence separating their respective properties; and she falsely accusing him of violating local building codes.

15. The Plaintiff complained to the Town mayor about Mrs. Ford-Ward's abuse of power and threats, but obtained no relief.

16. In the spring of 2025, Bruceton Town Police Officer Jeff Winberry served the Plaintiff with a misdemeanor summons for having poultry within the Town limits. At the time, the Town openly failed to enforce any such restrictions against several poultry and livestock owners throughout the city limits. Town officials advised the Plaintiff that if he paid a fee and if Renee Ford-Ward agreed, they would overlook any violation.

17. In addition, Mrs. Ford-Ward caused a complaint to be issued against Mr. Pardue for sorting and hauling scrap metal. This charge proved also to be spurious and he was determined to be in compliance with the local ordinance.

18. In the late summer of 2025, law enforcement officials came to the Plaintiff's property again and advised him to erect "No Trespassing" signs on all sides of his property. The Plaintiff did as instructed. But within days of doing so, Renee Ford-Ward trespassed on to his property, ripped down the signs and threw them in her trash can. Mr. Pardue called for police protection, and Bruceton Police Officer Danny Emerson came to the scene. After Officer Emerson retrieved the signs from Mrs. Ford-Ward's trash can, Mr. Pardue asked him to issue a criminal warrant against Mrs. Ford-Ward. Officer

Emerson responded that he could not arrest Mrs. Ford-Ward because she was an Alderman and he would lose his job.

19. On November 11, 2025, Mr. Pardue spoke at a public hearing of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen for the Town of Bruceton. He addressed the pattern of harassment and intimidation by Alderman Ford-Ward over the course of several years. His public remarks were live-streamed to the Town of Bruceton's Facebook page. During his public address, Mr. Pardue relayed the remarks made to him by Officer Danny Emerson and his refusal to cite Alderman Ford-Ward with trespassing for fear of retaliation and losing his job.

20. During his presentation to the Board, one Alderman asked rhetorically: "What good is the Bruceton Police Department if they will not enforce the law?" Two other Aldermen commented that it appeared to them Mr. Pardue was being targeted.

21. At the hearing on November 11, 2025, the Plaintiff also presented a petition signed by approximately 125 local residents calling for modification of the Town's fence ordinance.

22. During the Plaintiff's comments to the Board, Police Chief Richard Crossno confronted Mr. Pardue and loudly demanded: "If an officer told you that (referring to the Plaintiff's statement about an officer refusing to arrest Alderman Ford-Ward), then I need the name of the officer!" The Plaintiff responded that the officer who made this statement was Bruceton Police Officer Danny Emerson.

23. After providing the name of the officer involved, Chief Crossno became visibly agitated and challenged the Plaintiff to "step outside" and discuss his accusation against Officer Emerson further.

24. The Plaintiff complied with Chief Crossno's request. When he did so, he was physically assaulted by Chief Crossno who punched the Plaintiff in the face. After being knocked to the ground, Chief Crossno threatened to have his subordinate officers who were standing by taze the Plaintiff. One of the Bruceton Police Officers responded by pressing his taze gun into Mr. Pardue's back while he was held to the ground.

25. Plaintiff alleges that at no time prior to this use of excessive force by Chief Crossno had he provoked such police brutality; nor had he committed any criminal offense or action that warranted such a malicious attack.

26. Plaintiff alleges that on or about January 5, 2026, Chief Richard Crossno was indicted by the Carroll County grand jury on a charge of aggravated assault and battery

V.
Causes of Action

COUNT I
42 U.S.C. § 1983
Violation of Free Speech Clause of First Amendment

27. Plaintiff incorporates verbatim by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs and does further allege as follows.

28. The Defendant Chief of Police Richard Crossno's intentional and malicious assault and battery upon the Plaintiff was motivated in whole or in

without fear of punishment, protecting various actions such as petitioning legislators, peaceful protests, signing petitions, and ensuring public access to lawmaking and holding officials accountable.

35. The Defendant Chief of Police Richard Crossno's intentional and malicious assault and battery upon the Plaintiff was motivated in whole or in part by the public remarks made by the Plaintiff at a public meeting of the Board of Mayor and Alderman for the Town of Bruceton, Tennessee, and in retaliation for his efforts in petitioning government officials for redress of grievances.

36. The actions of Chief of Police Richard Crossno were committed with careless or reckless disregard and deliberate indifference to the Plaintiff's clearly established constitutional right to petition as protected by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

37. As a direct consequence of the Defendant Crossno's actions as described herein, the Plaintiff suffered personal injury, humiliation, mental anguish and embarrassment for which he is entitled to a judgment for compensatory and punitive damages.

COUNT III

42 U.S.C. § 1983
Excessive Force
Violation of Substantive Due Process Under the Fourth Amendment

38. Plaintiff incorporates verbatim by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs and does further allege as follows.

39. The Fourth Amendment's prohibition against unreasonable seizures bars excessive force against free citizens

40. The degree of force purposely and knowingly used by Defendant Crossno against the Plaintiff was objectively unreasonable.

41. In addition, the threat to "taze" the Plaintiff after he was knocked to the ground by Defendant Crossno was also a degree of force purposely and knowingly used by the Defendant and was objectively unreasonable.

42. The use of excessive force was committed with careless or reckless disregard and deliberate indifference to the Plaintiff's clearly established constitutional rights to be free from an unreasonable seizure under the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

43. As a direct consequence of the Defendant Crossno's actions as described herein, the Plaintiff suffered personal injury, humiliation, mental anguish and embarrassment for which he is entitled to a judgment for compensatory and punitive damages.

COUNT IV

42 U.S.C. § 1983
Municipal Liability

44. Plaintiff incorporates verbatim by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs and does further allege as follows.

45. Richard Crossno was elected to the position of Chief of Police by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen for the Town of Bruceton on January 11, 2022.

46. Prior to his election as Chief of Police, Mr. Crossno had worked in law enforcement since 1998, and had worked for the Carroll County Sheriff's Department and the Huntington Police Department.

47. As the Chief of Police, Mr. Crossno is the Town of Bruceton's highest-ranking law enforcement officer and possesses final authority to make policy regarding the conduct of officers on the police force.

48. Chief Crossno also manages and supervises the local police force to implement the town's policies and goals.

49. Defendant Crossno's actions as described herein constitute those of a "policy maker" under state law and for purposes of *City of St. Louis v. Praprotnik*, 108 S.Ct. 915, 925, 485 U.S. 112, 126 (U.S.1988).

50. The actions of the Defendant Crossno were carried out under color of state law and constitute the *de facto* policy of the Town of Bruceton, and with deliberate indifference and careless or reckless disregard for the Plaintiff's clearly established constitutional rights.

51. The Town of Bruceton is liable to the Plaintiff under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for a) the retaliation against the Plaintiff under color of state law for the exercise of his right of free speech; b) the retaliation against the Plaintiff under color of state law for exercising his right to petition; and c) the use of excessive force in violation of his constitutional rights under the Fourth Amendment.

52. As a direct consequence of the Town's violation of the Plaintiff's constitutionally-protected rights as described herein, the Plaintiff suffered

personal injury, humiliation, mental anguish and embarrassment for which he is entitled to a judgment for compensatory damages.

COUNT V

Assault

53. Plaintiff incorporates verbatim by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs and does further allege as follows.

54. The actions of the Defendant Richard Crossno constitute an actionable tort of assault.

55. As a direct consequence of the Defendant Crossno's actions as described herein, the Plaintiff suffered personal injury, humiliation, mental anguish and embarrassment for which he is entitled to a judgment for compensatory and punitive damages.

COUNT V

Battery

56. Plaintiff incorporates verbatim by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs and does further allege as follows.

57. The actions of the Defendant Richard Crossno constitute an actionable tort of battery.

58. As a direct consequence of the Defendant Crossno's actions as described herein, the Plaintiff suffered personal injury, humiliation, mental anguish and embarrassment for which he is entitled to a judgment for compensatory and punitive damages.

Request for Relief

Declaratory Judgment

1. An actual controversy exists between the parties as to whether the Defendant Town of Bruceton's policies, practices and customs with regard to their regulation of otherwise constitutionally protected free speech activity and assembly. Plaintiff alleges that the Defendant Town of Bruceton's policies, practices, customs and usage regarding control over access to its public grounds for purposes of free speech activity are enforced in an arbitrary manner and therefore violate the Fourth Amendment, as well as the First Amendment. Plaintiff respectfully requests a declaratory judgment that the actions of the Defendants violate the federal constitutional rights of the Plaintiff.

Nominal Damages

2. Plaintiff seeks an order awarding nominal damages for the Defendants' violation of his federal constitutional rights.

Compensatory Damages

3. Plaintiff seeks an order awarding compensatory damages against the Defendant for violation of his federal constitutional rights in the amount of $2,000,000.00.

Punitive Damages

4. Plaintiff seeks an order awarding punitive damages against the Defendant Richard Crossno for violation of his federal and state constitutional rights in an amount to be determined by the jury.

Attorney's Fees and Costs

5. Plaintiff seeks an order awarding the costs of this cause, including attorney's fees, costs and expenses under 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

Jury Demand

6. Plaintiff demands a jury of six to hear and try this case.

Other Relief

7. Plaintiff additionally requests such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAIN LAW GROUP, PLLC
By:

/s/ Larry L. Crain
Larry L. Crain, Tenn. Sup. Crt. # 9040
Crain Law Group, PLLC
5214 Maryland Way, Suite 402
Brentwood, TN 37027
Tel. (615) 376-2600
Email: Larry@crainlaw.legal

Emily A. Castro
Tn. Sup. Crt. No. 28203
5214 Maryland Way
Suite 402
Brentwood, TN 37027
Tel. 615-376-2600
Fax. 615-345-6009
Email: Emily@crainlaw.legal

Attorneys for the Plaintiff Jonathan Pardue

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. *(SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)*

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Jonathan Pardue

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Carroll
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys *(Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)*
Larry L. Crain, Esq.
Crain Law Group
5214 Maryland Way, Suite 402 615-376-2600
Brentwood, Tennessee 37027

DEFENDANTS

Richard Crossno, in his individual capacity, and the Town of Bruceton, Tennessee

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Carroll
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)
NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys *(If Known)*

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION *(Place an "X" in One Box Only)*

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
- ☑ 3 Federal Question *(U.S. Government Not a Party)*
- ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- ☐ 4 Diversity *(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)*

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES *(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)*
(For Diversity Cases Only)

	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF
Citizen of This State	☐ 1	☐ 1	Incorporated *or* Principal Place of Business In This State	☐ 4	☐ 4
Citizen of Another State	☐ 2	☐ 2	Incorporated *and* Principal Place of Business In Another State	☐ 5	☐ 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	☐ 3	☐ 3	Foreign Nation	☐ 6	☐ 6

IV. NATURE OF SUIT *(Place an "X" in One Box Only)*

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

CONTRACT
- ☐ 110 Insurance
- ☐ 120 Marine
- ☐ 130 Miller Act
- ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument
- ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment
- ☐ 151 Medicare Act
- ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)
- ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits
- ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits
- ☐ 190 Other Contract
- ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability
- ☐ 196 Franchise

TORTS

PERSONAL INJURY
- ☐ 310 Airplane
- ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability
- ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander
- ☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability
- ☐ 340 Marine
- ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability
- ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle
- ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability
- ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury
- ☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice

PERSONAL INJURY
- ☐ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability
- ☐ 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability
- ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability

PERSONAL PROPERTY
- ☐ 370 Other Fraud
- ☐ 371 Truth in Lending
- ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage
- ☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability

FORFEITURE/PENALTY
- ☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881
- ☐ 690 Other

LABOR
- ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act
- ☐ 720 Labor/Management Relations
- ☐ 740 Railway Labor Act
- ☐ 751 Family and Medical Leave Act
- ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation
- ☐ 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act

IMMIGRATION
- ☐ 462 Naturalization Application
- ☐ 465 Other Immigration Actions

BANKRUPTCY
- ☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158
- ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS
- ☐ 820 Copyrights
- ☐ 830 Patent
- ☐ 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application
- ☐ 840 Trademark
- ☐ 880 Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016

SOCIAL SECURITY
- ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)
- ☐ 862 Black Lung (923)
- ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))
- ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI
- ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))

FEDERAL TAX SUITS
- ☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)
- ☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609

OTHER STATUTES
- ☐ 375 False Claims Act
- ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))
- ☐ 400 State Reapportionment
- ☐ 410 Antitrust
- ☐ 430 Banks and Banking
- ☐ 450 Commerce
- ☐ 460 Deportation
- ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
- ☐ 480 Consumer Credit (15 USC 1681 or 1692)
- ☐ 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act
- ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV
- ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
- ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions
- ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
- ☐ 893 Environmental Matters
- ☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act
- ☐ 896 Arbitration
- ☐ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision
- ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes

REAL PROPERTY
- ☐ 210 Land Condemnation
- ☐ 220 Foreclosure
- ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment
- ☐ 240 Torts to Land
- ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability
- ☐ 290 All Other Real Property

CIVIL RIGHTS
- ☒ 440 Other Civil Rights
- ☐ 441 Voting
- ☐ 442 Employment
- ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations
- ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment
- ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other
- ☐ 448 Education

PRISONER PETITIONS

Habeas Corpus:
- ☐ 463 Alien Detainee
- ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence
- ☐ 530 General
- ☐ 535 Death Penalty

Other:
- ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other
- ☐ 550 Civil Rights
- ☐ 555 Prison Condition
- ☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement

V. ORIGIN *(Place an "X" in One Box Only)*

☑ 1 Original Proceeding ☐ 2 Removed from State Court ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened ☐ 5 Transferred from Another District *(specify)* ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer ☐ 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing *(Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity)*:
42 U.S.C. Section 1983

Brief description of cause:
Violation of free speech and excessive force

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.

DEMAND $ 2,000,000.00

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:
JURY DEMAND: ☑ Yes ☐ No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE _____ DOCKET NUMBER _____

DATE 01/08/2026

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ Larry L. Crain

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # _____ AMOUNT _____ APPLYING IFP _____ JUDGE _____ MAG. JUDGE _____

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.

(b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)

(c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)

III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.

IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.
Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.
Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441.
Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.
Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.
PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.

VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service.

VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.
Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.
Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related cases, if any. If there are related cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.