

## **Question**

The complaint details a series of alleged criminal acts—wire fraud, interstate transportation of fraudulent documents, and conspiracy—resulting in financial and business harm to the plaintiff, rather than seeking to alter marital status or determine support or custody. Federal courts have jurisdiction over civil RICO claims and other federal statutory claims, even if the underlying facts arise from a family context, so long as the relief sought is not a divorce, alimony, or child custody decree. See *Marshall v. Marshall*, 547 U.S. 293, 307-08 (2006). Since the plaintiff is not asking the federal court to dissolve a marriage, award alimony, or determine custody, but instead seeks damages and injunctive relief for alleged racketeering activity, the dispute is not a domestic relations dispute, but a federal statutory claim properly within federal jurisdiction.

## **Answer (U.S. Federal)**

### **Short response**

Federal courts have jurisdiction over civil RICO claims even when they arise from family contexts, provided the relief sought is not a divorce, alimony, or child custody decree. The case presents a legitimate federal question under [28 U.S.C. § 1331](#) and [18 U.S.C. § 1964](#) because it seeks damages for business and property injuries resulting from alleged racketeering activity rather than domestic relations remedies.

### **Summary**

The distinction between domestic relations matters and federal statutory claims is critical for determining federal court jurisdiction. When a complaint alleges violations of federal statutes like RICO and seeks remedies for business or property injuries rather than alterations to marital status or family arrangements, federal jurisdiction is proper despite family-related underlying facts. This jurisdiction is established through both [28 U.S.C. § 1331](#), which provides federal courts with jurisdiction over cases arising under federal law, and [18 U.S.C. § 1964](#), which specifically grants jurisdiction over civil RICO claims.

The courts have consistently recognized that the domestic relations exception to federal jurisdiction is limited to cases seeking divorce, alimony, or child custody decrees. When a plaintiff's claims involve alleged criminal acts such as wire fraud, transportation of fraudulent documents, and conspiracy that result in financial and business harm, the relief sought (damages and injunctive relief) falls squarely within federal statutory protection regardless of the family context from which the facts arise. The focus should be on the nature of the claims and remedies sought rather than the underlying factual context when determining whether federal jurisdiction is appropriate.

# **Background and Relevant Law**

## **Federal Statutory Framework for Jurisdiction**

Federal jurisdiction over civil RICO claims is established through two primary statutory provisions: the general federal question jurisdiction statute and the specific RICO civil remedies provision.

[28 U.S.C. § 1331](#) provides the foundational basis for federal jurisdiction: "The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States," [28 U.S.C. § 1331](#). This statute establishes federal question jurisdiction, which encompasses cases that involve claims based on federal law.

Building on this general jurisdiction, the RICO statute contains specific provisions granting federal courts authority to hear civil claims arising from racketeering activities. Under [18 U.S.C. § 1964](#)(c), "Any person injured in his business or property by reason of a violation of section 1962 of this chapter may sue therefor in any appropriate United States district court and shall recover threefold the damages he sustains and the cost of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee..." [18 U.S.C. § 1964](#). This provision explicitly grants federal courts jurisdiction over civil RICO claims and establishes the remedies available to plaintiffs.

The underlying prohibited activities that form the basis of RICO claims are enumerated in [18 U.S.C. § 1962](#), which makes it unlawful for:

1. Any person who has received income from racketeering activity to use or invest that income in an enterprise affecting interstate commerce
2. Any person to acquire or maintain interests in enterprises through racketeering activity
3. Any person associated with an enterprise to participate in the conduct of its affairs through racketeering activity
4. Any person to conspire to violate the above provisions

[18 U.S.C. § 1962](#) states: "It shall be unlawful for any person who has received any income derived, directly or indirectly, from a pattern of racketeering activity or through collection of an unlawful debt... to use or invest, directly or indirectly, any part of such income, or the proceeds of such income, in acquisition of any interest in, or the establishment or operation of, any enterprise which is engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce..."

The statute further prohibits acquiring or maintaining "any interest in or control of any enterprise which is engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce" through racketeering activity, as well as conducting an enterprise's affairs "through a pattern of racketeering activity." Additionally, it prohibits conspiring to commit any of these acts. [18 U.S.C. § 1962](#).

## **Case Law on Federal Jurisdiction Over RICO Claims in Family Contexts**

Several court decisions have addressed the intersection of federal statutory claims and matters arising from family contexts. These cases establish that federal courts have jurisdiction over federal statutory claims, including RICO claims, even when they arise from family-related factual scenarios, provided they do not seek typical domestic relations remedies.

In [Wiesmueller v. Oliver, Case No. 3:18-cv-01257 \(M.D. Tenn. Jun 17, 2019\)](#), the court addressed the issue of federal-question jurisdiction in cases with domestic relations elements. The court noted: "Mr. Wiesmueller asserts two bases for the Court's subject-matter jurisdiction over this action: [28 U.S.C. § 1331](#), which provides district courts with federal-question jurisdiction over 'all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States,' and [18 U.S.C. § 1964](#), which provides jurisdiction over RICO claims." The court applied the well-pleaded complaint rule to determine whether federal-question jurisdiction existed under either provision.

Critically, the Wiesmueller court emphasized that "the 'key question is whether the case is 'a core domestic relations case, seeking a declaration of marital or parental status, or a [federal] claim in which it is incidental that the underlying dispute involves a [domestic relations dispute].'" This distinction is fundamental to determining whether federal jurisdiction is appropriate in cases with family-related backgrounds but presenting federal statutory claims.

Similarly, in [Ellis v. Warner, CASE NO. 15-10134-CIV-GOODMAN \(S.D. Fla. Feb 16, 2017\)](#), the court addressed federal jurisdiction over RICO claims in the context of related state court proceedings. The court noted that when a plaintiff "does not challenge the outcome of the probate proceeding; rather, her complaint is under [among other claims] the federal RICO statute," the Rooker-Feldman doctrine (which prohibits federal courts from hearing appeals from state court judgments) is inapplicable.

The Ellis court further stated: "If a federal plaintiff present[s] [an] independent claim, then it is not a bar to the exercise of federal jurisdiction that the 'same or a related question' was at issue between the parties in state court." This principle is instructive for cases where RICO claims arise from contexts that might otherwise involve state family courts, as it reinforces that independent federal claims remain within federal jurisdiction despite related state matters.

More recently, [Green v. Davis, Civil Action 23-359-BAJ-EWD \(M.D. La. May 30, 2023\)](#) affirmed that "a RICO claim can establish federal question jurisdiction." This straightforward declaration underscores that RICO claims, by their nature, establish federal jurisdiction regardless of the factual context from which they arise.

In [Diaz v. Green Tree Servicing, LLC, No. C15-359RSL \(W.D. Wash. May 29, 2015\)](#), the court elaborated on the nature of RICO claims, noting: "RICO provides for both criminal and civil liability. The civil remedies provision of

RICO permits '[a]ny person injured in his business or property' by reason of a violation of RICO's substantive provisions to bring a civil action for treble damages. [18 U.S.C. § 1964\(c\)](#) (2012)."

## Secondary Materials on Civil RICO Claims

The secondary source [Civil Rico: A Tool of Advocacy](#) (2024) provides additional insight into the structure and application of civil RICO claims: "The civil racketeering provisions of RICO involve three main sections of the statute: § 1961 provides the definitions, § 1962 describes the prohibited conduct, and § 1964 details the remedies. Federal subject matter jurisdiction is conferred by § 1964(c), which creates the civil RICO cause of action..."

This source further clarifies that "RICO's prohibitions may be enforced in both criminal and civil contexts. In the context of a civil action, a plaintiff must be directly injured by reason of the defendant's racketeering activities." This distinction highlights the separation between criminal prosecution and civil remedies under RICO, with the latter focusing on providing redress to individuals injured in their business or property.

The secondary material also emphasizes the causation requirement for civil RICO claims: "Proximate cause, as an aspect of RICO's 'by reason of' standard, requires a RICO plaintiff to show that the defendant's racketeering offenses led directly to the plaintiff's injuries." This requirement ensures that federal courts only hear RICO claims where there is a direct connection between the alleged racketeering activity and the harm suffered.

## Analysis

### The Nature of the Claims and Relief Sought

The complaint in question details alleged criminal acts—specifically wire fraud, interstate transportation of fraudulent documents, and conspiracy—that purportedly resulted in financial and business harm to the plaintiff. Crucially, the complaint does not seek domestic relations remedies such as divorce, alimony, or child custody. Instead, it seeks damages and injunctive relief for alleged racketeering activity.

This distinction is fundamental to the question of federal jurisdiction. While the factual background may involve family relationships, the actual claims presented arise under federal law (RICO) and seek remedies specifically authorized by federal statutes. This places the case squarely within the jurisdiction granted by [28 U.S.C. § 1331](#) (federal question) and [18 U.S.C. § 1964](#) (civil RICO).

As the court in [Wiesmueller v. Oliver, Case No. 3:18-cv-01257 \(M.D. Tenn. Jun 17, 2019\)](#) noted, the key question is whether the case is "a core domestic relations case, seeking a declaration of marital or parental status, or a [federal] claim in which it is incidental that the underlying dispute involves a [domestic relations dispute]." Here, the facts clearly indicate the

latter—the case presents federal statutory claims (RICO violations) for which the family context is merely incidental to the claims themselves.

## Federal Statutory Basis for Jurisdiction

RICO provides a clear statutory basis for federal jurisdiction. Under [18 U.S.C. § 1964](#)(c), "[a]ny person injured in his business or property by reason of a violation of section 1962 of this chapter may sue therefor in any appropriate United States district court..." [18 U.S.C. § 1964](#). This provision explicitly grants jurisdiction to federal district courts over civil RICO claims.

The alleged criminal acts—wire fraud, interstate transportation of fraudulent documents, and conspiracy—fall within the prohibited activities described in [18 U.S.C. § 1962](#), which makes it unlawful for individuals to engage in or conspire to engage in patterns of racketeering activity affecting interstate commerce. [18 U.S.C. § 1962](#). RICO specifically identifies certain predicate acts, including wire fraud, that constitute "racketeering activity" when committed in a pattern.

Additionally, the general federal question statute, [28 U.S.C. § 1331](#), provides that "district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States." [28 U.S.C. § 1331](#). Since RICO is a federal law, claims arising under it necessarily invoke federal question jurisdiction.

As confirmed in [Green v. Davis, Civil Action 23-359-BAJ-EWD \(M.D. La. May 30, 2023\)](#), "a RICO claim can establish federal question jurisdiction." This straightforward principle applies regardless of whether the underlying facts involve family relationships.

## Distinguishing Between Family Law Matters and Federal Claims

The distinction between domestic relations matters and federal statutory claims is crucial for determining federal jurisdiction. While federal courts generally abstain from hearing "domestic relations" cases (those seeking divorce, alimony, or child custody), they maintain jurisdiction over federal statutory claims even when the factual background involves family relationships.

The case presented does not ask the federal court to dissolve a marriage, award alimony, or determine child custody. Instead, it seeks damages and injunctive relief for alleged racketeering activity that caused financial and business harm. These remedies are explicitly provided for under federal law and are distinct from domestic relations remedies.

As noted in [Civil Rico: A Tool of Advocacy](#) (2024), civil RICO actions require that a "plaintiff must be directly injured by reason of the defendant's racketeering activities." This focus on business or property injury further distinguishes RICO claims from domestic relations matters, which primarily concern personal status and family arrangements.

The fact that the alleged criminal acts may have occurred within or been related to a family context does not transform the claims into domestic relations matters. What matters for jurisdictional purposes is the nature of the claims asserted and the relief sought, not the factual background from which they arise.

## **Precedent Supporting Federal Jurisdiction**

The principle that federal courts have jurisdiction over federal statutory claims despite family-related factual contexts is supported by case law. In [Ellis v. Warner, CASE NO. 15-10134-CIV-GOODMAN \(S.D. Fla. Feb 16, 2017\)](#), the court recognized that when a plaintiff "does not challenge the outcome of the probate proceeding; rather, her complaint is under [among other claims] the federal RICO statute," federal jurisdiction is appropriate. This principle applies equally to the present case, where the plaintiff is not challenging family court determinations but is instead asserting independent federal claims.

Similarly, [Diaz v. Green Tree Servicing, LLC, No. C15-359RSL \(W.D. Wash. May 29, 2015\)](#) confirms that RICO's civil remedies provision permits "any person injured in his business or property by reason of a violation of RICO's substantive provisions to bring a civil action for treble damages." This broad grant of authority to bring civil RICO claims in federal court does not exclude cases simply because they arise from contexts that might otherwise involve state family courts.

## **Exceptions and Caveats**

### **The Domestic Relations Exception to Federal Jurisdiction**

One important caveat to federal jurisdiction is the "domestic relations exception," which limits federal courts' authority to hear cases involving divorce, alimony, and child custody. However, this exception is narrowly defined and does not extend to all cases with family-related backgrounds.

As the analysis above demonstrates, the domestic relations exception does not apply when a plaintiff asserts federal statutory claims seeking remedies for injuries to business or property, even if the factual context involves family relationships. The key is that the plaintiff is not asking the federal court to issue a divorce decree, award alimony, or determine child custody—remedies that would fall within the domestic relations exception.

It's worth noting that the domestic relations exception is a judicially created doctrine rather than a statutory limitation on federal jurisdiction. As such, courts have consistently interpreted it narrowly, confining it to core domestic relations matters rather than extending it to all cases with family-related backgrounds.

## **Proximate Cause Requirement for RICO Claims**

Another important caveat is the proximate cause requirement for RICO claims. As noted in [Civil Rico: A Tool of Advocacy](#) (2024), "Proximate cause, as an aspect of RICO's 'by reason of' standard, requires a RICO plaintiff to show that the defendant's racketeering offenses led directly to the plaintiff's injuries."

This means that to maintain federal jurisdiction under RICO, the plaintiff must establish not only that the alleged criminal acts occurred but also that these acts directly caused the claimed financial and business harm. If the connection between the alleged racketeering activity and the claimed injuries is too attenuated or speculative, the court might find that the plaintiff lacks standing to bring a RICO claim, which could affect federal jurisdiction.

## **Potential Abstention Doctrines**

Although federal jurisdiction over RICO claims is clear, courts have developed various abstention doctrines that might lead a federal court to decline to exercise jurisdiction in certain circumstances. For example, the Younger abstention doctrine might apply if there are ongoing state proceedings involving the same matters, and the Rooker-Feldman doctrine might prevent federal courts from hearing cases that effectively seek review of state court judgments.

However, as noted in [Ellis v. Warner, CASE NO. 15-10134-CIV-GOODMAN \(S.D. Fla. Feb 16, 2017\)](#), "If a federal plaintiff present[s] [an] independent claim, then it is not a bar to the exercise of federal jurisdiction that the 'same or a related question' was at issue between the parties in state court." This suggests that abstention would not be appropriate in cases like the one presented, where the plaintiff is asserting independent federal claims rather than seeking to overturn state court determinations.

## **Conclusion**

Based on the applicable federal statutes and case law, federal courts clearly have jurisdiction over civil RICO claims and other federal statutory claims, even if the underlying facts arise from a family context, so long as the relief sought is not a divorce, alimony, or child custody decree. This principle is firmly established by both statutory provisions ([28 U.S.C. § 1331](#) and [18 U.S.C. § 1964](#)) and case law.

The complaint described alleges criminal acts—wire fraud, interstate transportation of fraudulent documents, and conspiracy—that resulted in financial and business harm to the plaintiff. These allegations fall squarely within the scope of RICO, which prohibits such activities when they form a pattern of racketeering. The plaintiff seeks damages and injunctive relief for alleged racketeering activity, remedies explicitly provided for under federal law, rather than asking the court to dissolve a marriage, award alimony, or determine custody.

As the courts have consistently recognized, what matters for jurisdictional purposes is the nature of the claims asserted and the relief sought, not the factual background from which they arise. Since the claims here arise under federal law (RICO) and seek remedies specifically authorized by federal statutes (damages for business or property injuries), they fall within federal jurisdiction despite the family-related factual context.

The domestic relations exception to federal jurisdiction is narrowly defined and does not extend to federal statutory claims seeking remedies for injuries to business or property. Therefore, the dispute presented is not a domestic relations dispute that would be excluded from federal jurisdiction, but rather a federal statutory claim properly within federal jurisdiction.

In conclusion, the federal court has proper subject matter jurisdiction over the complaint described, as it presents legitimate federal questions under both [28 U.S.C. § 1331](#) and [18 U.S.C. § 1964](#), and seeks remedies for alleged violations of federal law rather than domestic relations remedies.

## Legal Authorities

[Diaz v. Green Tree Servicing, LLC, No. C15-359RSL \(W.D. Wash. May 29, 2015\)](#)

### **U.S. District Court — Western District of Washington**

#### **Extract**

In counts I through III of their complaint, plaintiffs allege three claims under the Racketeer Influenced and Corruption Organization Act ('RICO'). Compl. (Dkt. # 1) ¶¶ 34-53. RICO provides for both criminal and civil liability. The civil remedies provision of RICO permits '[a]ny person injured in his business or property' by reason of a violation of RICO's substantive provisions to bring a civil action for treble damages. 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c) (2012). RICO's substantive provisions take aim at 'racketeering activity,' which the statute defines as a number of specific criminal acts under state and federal laws, including federal mail fraud. *Canyon Cnty. v. Syngenta Seeds, Inc.*, 519 F.3d 969, 972 (9th Cir. 2008).

#### **Summary**

Nature of RICO claims, which are federal statutory claims that provide for civil liability when a person is injured in their business or property due to racketeering activity. This aligns with the proposition that federal courts have jurisdiction over civil RICO claims, even if the underlying facts arise from a family context, as long as the relief sought is not related to domestic relations. The passage supports the idea that the federal court can hear the case if it involves RICO claims seeking damages for business or property harm.

[Ellis v. Warner, CASE NO. 15-10134-CIV-GOODMAN \(S.D. Fla. Feb 16, 2017\)](#)

## **U.S. District Court — Southern District of Florida**

### **Extract**

Essentially, like the plaintiff in Laudien v. Caudill, 92 F. Supp. 3d 614, 621 (E.D. Ky. 2015), Plaintiff 'does not challenge the outcome of the probate proceeding; rather, her complaint is under [among other claims] the federal RICO statute,' thus Rooker-Feldman is inapplicable. (internal citations omitted). 'If a federal plaintiff present[s] [an]independent claim,' then it is not a bar to the exercise of federal jurisdiction that the 'same or a related question' was at issue between the parties in state court. See Exxon, 544 U.S. at 292-93.

### **Summary**

Federal jurisdiction is appropriate for independent claims under federal statutes like RICO, even if related issues were previously addressed in state court. The court distinguishes between challenging a state court's decision and pursuing a separate federal statutory claim. This supports the proposition that federal courts can hear RICO claims arising from family contexts, provided the relief sought is not related to altering marital status or determining support or custody.

[Green v. Davis, Civil Action 23-359-BAJ-EWD \(M.D. La. May 30, 2023\)](#)

## **U.S. District Court — Middle District of Louisiana**

### **Extract**

Federal subject matter jurisdiction may generally be established in two ways that are relevant to this case. First, this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over 'civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treatises of the United States.' ... On the other hand, there is a private cause of action for a violation of the Racketeer Influence and Corrupt Organizations ('RICO') Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1961, et seq., and a RICO claim can establish federal question jurisdiction.

### **Summary**

A RICO claim can establish federal question jurisdiction, which supports the proposition that federal courts can hear cases involving alleged racketeering activities, even if they arise from a family context, as long as the relief sought is not related to domestic relations.

[Wiesmueller v. Oliver, Case No. 3:18-cv-01257 \(M.D. Tenn. Jun 17, 2019\)](#)

## **U.S. District Court — Middle District of Tennessee**

### **Extract**

Mr. Wiesmueller asserts two bases for the Court's subject-matter jurisdiction over this action: 28 U.S.C. § 1331, which provides district courts with federal-question jurisdiction over 'all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States,' and 18 U.S.C. § 1964, which provides jurisdiction over RICO claims. To determine whether federal-question jurisdiction exists under either provision, the Court must apply the well-pleaded complaint rule, which asks whether 'a federal question is presented on the face of the plaintiff's properly pleaded complaint.' ... the 'key question is whether the case is 'a core domestic relations case, seeking a declaration of marital or parental status, or a [federal] claim in which it is incidental that the underlying dispute involves a[domestic relations dispute].'

### **Summary**

Criteria for federal-question jurisdiction, emphasizing that federal courts have jurisdiction over RICO claims and other federal statutory claims if a federal question is presented on the face of the complaint. It distinguishes between core domestic relations cases and federal claims where the domestic context is incidental. This supports the proposition that federal courts can adjudicate RICO claims arising from a family context if the relief sought is not related to altering marital status or determining support or custody.

## [28 U.S.C. § 1331 28 U.S.C. § 1331 Federal Question](#)

### **Extract**

The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.

### **Summary**

28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants federal district courts original jurisdiction over civil actions that arise under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. This supports the proposition that federal courts have jurisdiction over civil RICO claims and other federal statutory claims, as these claims arise under federal law. The passage confirms that the nature of the claim, rather than the context from which it arises, determines federal jurisdiction. Therefore, even if the underlying facts are related to a family context, as long as the relief sought is not related to divorce, alimony, or child custody, federal jurisdiction is appropriate.

## [18 U.S.C. § 1964 18 U.S.C. § 1964 Civil Remedies](#)

## **Extract**

Any person injured in his business or property by reason of a violation of section 1962 of this chapter may sue therefor in any appropriate United States district court and shall recover threefold the damages he sustains and the cost of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee...

## **Summary**

Individuals injured in their business or property due to a violation of section 1962 (RICO) can bring a suit in federal court and recover damages. This supports the proposition that federal courts have jurisdiction over civil RICO claims, even if the underlying facts arise from a family context, as long as the relief sought is not related to domestic relations but rather to business or property harm.

## [18 U.S.C. § 1962 18 U.S.C. § 1962 Prohibited Activities](#)

## **Extract**

It shall be unlawful for any person who has received any income derived, directly or indirectly, from a pattern of racketeering activity or through collection of an unlawful debt... to use or invest, directly or indirectly, any part of such income, or the proceeds of such income, in acquisition of any interest in, or the establishment or operation of, any enterprise which is engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce... It shall be unlawful for any person through a pattern of racketeering activity or through collection of an unlawful debt to acquire or maintain, directly or indirectly, any interest in or control of any enterprise which is engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce... It shall be unlawful for any person employed by or associated with any enterprise engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce, to conduct or participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such enterprise's affairs through a pattern of racketeering activity or collection of unlawful debt... It shall be unlawful for any person to conspire to violate any of the provisions of subsection (a), (b), or (c) of this section.

## **Summary**

18 U.S.C. § 1962 outlines the unlawful activities related to racketeering, which include using income derived from racketeering, acquiring or maintaining interest in enterprises through racketeering, and participating in enterprises through racketeering. These activities are relevant to the proposition because they establish the basis for federal jurisdiction over RICO claims, which are distinct from domestic relations disputes. The statute's focus on interstate or foreign commerce further supports the federal jurisdiction aspect.

## [Civil Rico: A Tool of Advocacy](#)

### **The Brief - American Bar Association - 2024-01-01**

#### **Extract**

The civil racketeering provisions of RICO involve three main sections of the statute: § 1961 provides the definitions, § 1962 describes the prohibited conduct, and § 1964 details the remedies. Federal subject matter jurisdiction is conferred by § 1964(c), which creates the civil RICO cause of action... RICO's prohibitions may be enforced in both criminal and civil contexts. In the context of a civil action, a plaintiff must be directly injured by reason of the defendant's racketeering activities. Proximate cause, as an aspect of RICO's "by reason of" standard, requires a RICO plaintiff to show that the defendant's racketeering offenses led directly to the plaintiff's injuries.

#### **Summary**

Jurisdictional basis for civil RICO claims under § 1964(c), which is relevant to establishing federal jurisdiction over claims involving racketeering activities. It emphasizes that RICO can be enforced in civil contexts and requires a direct injury to the plaintiff's business or property, aligning with the proposition that the federal court has jurisdiction over such claims even if they arise from a family context, as long as they do not seek to alter marital status or determine support or custody.

This memo was compiled by Vincent AI based on vLex materials available as of June 22, 2025. [View full answer on vLex](#)