

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-13763
Non-Argument Calendar

FILED U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT March 9, 2007 THOMAS K. KAHN CLERK
--

D. C. Docket No. 06-00217-CV-WS-M

LINDA CONE SELENSKY,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

MOBILE INFIRMARY,
DR. JAMES BARRETT,
DR. CLAUDE BROWN,
COLEMAN AMERICAN MOVING, INC.,
GALLAGHER-BASSETT, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Alabama

(March 9, 2007)

Before DUBINA, CARNES and BARKETT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Linda Cone Selensky, acting pro se, appeals the dismissal without prejudice of her civil action against Mobile Infirmary, a group of doctors, Coleman American Moving, Inc., and an entity called Gallagher-Bassett, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

In order for a federal district court to have jurisdiction over a claim, a plaintiff must show, on the face of the complaint, either complete diversity of citizenship or that a “substantial” issue of federal law is raised by the claim. See Dunlap v. G&L Holding Group, Inc., 381 F.3d 1285, 1290 (11th Cir. 2004) (citations omitted). Because Selensky’s claims were based on allegations of tortious and fraudulent conduct by private actors within her state of residence, and because she did not plead facts sufficient to demonstrate complete diversity of citizenship among the parties or to state a claim involving a substantial question of federal law, the district court did not err in dismissing the action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Accordingly, we affirm.

AFFIRMED.