

TRULINCS 07405510 - LYNCH, JASON M - Unit: ERE-D-A

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT ARKANSAS

MAR 06 2026

SUBJECT: RE: Venue Summery
DATE: 01/06/2026 11:06:02 PM

TAMMY H. DOWNS, CLERK
By:  DEP CLERK

Below is a clear, court-ready explanation using everything known about Jason Matthew Lynch (Reg. No. 07405-510) that explains all three of his cases, why each is properly filed in a different court, why they may proceed at the same time, and why they are legally distinct and must be heard.

OVERVIEW: THREE SEPARATE CASES THREE SEPARATE JURISDICTIONS

Jason Matthew Lynch has three different legal actions, each based on different sources of law, different sovereign authority, different remedies, and different defendants' legal capacities.
They are not duplicative, not barred, and not mutually exclusive.

Federal law expressly allows this.

CASE ONE

Federal Civil Rights Case

Court: United States District Court
Eastern District of Arkansas Central Division
Case No.: 4:24-cv-00740-LPR-BBM

A. What This Case Is

This case arises under federal law, specifically:

42 U.S.C. § 1983 Constitutional violations under color of state law

42 U.S.C. § 1985 Conspiracy to deprive civil rights

42 U.S.C. § 1981 Equal protection and nondiscrimination

U.S. Constitution:

Eighth Amendment (deliberate indifference to serious medical needs)

First Amendment (religion, access to courts, retaliation)

Fourteenth Amendment (due process and equal protection)

B. Core Facts

Denial and interruption of life-sustaining HIV medication (Biktarvy) for ~100 days

Denial of Catholic religious practices

Interference with legal mail and court access

TRULINCS 07405510 - LYNCH, JASON M - Unit: ERE-D-A

Retaliation for grievances

Systemic unconstitutional jail policies

Conduct under color of state law by jail officials, sheriff, county actors, and contracted medical providers

C. Why Federal Court Is the Proper Court

Federal court has exclusive and original jurisdiction over:

Federal constitutional claims

Civil rights statutes enacted by Congress

28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343 mandate federal jurisdiction.

State courts cannot provide full relief for federal constitutional violations of this nature.

CASE TWO

Arkansas State Constitutional & Tort Action

Court: White County Circuit Court
State of Arkansas

A. What This Case Is

This case arises under Arkansas state law, including:

Arkansas Constitution (state analogs to due process and human dignity)

Arkansas tort law, including:

Medical negligence

Outrage / Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (IIED)

Negligent supervision

Civil conspiracy under state law

Willful and wanton misconduct

B. Core Facts

Same time period, but different legal lens

Focuses on:

Extreme and outrageous conduct

Emotional trauma

TRULINCS 07405510 - LYNCH, JASON M - Unit: ERE-D-A

Psychological injury

Breach of duties owed under Arkansas law

Conduct exceeding negligence into recklessness and malice

C. Why State Circuit Court Is the Proper Court

Arkansas circuit courts have original jurisdiction over:

State tort claims

State constitutional violations

Arkansas tort remedies cannot be fully adjudicated in federal court without supplemental jurisdiction and Lynch is not required to surrender state remedies.

Arkansas has a sovereign interest in adjudicating violations of its own laws by county officials.

CASE THREE

Federal Tort / Non-§1983 Medical Accountability Case

Court: Proper federal forum (depending on defendants)

May include:

Federal negligence standards

Claims against federal or quasi-federal actors

Claims arising after transfer to federal custody

Bivens-type or FTCA-related conduct (as applicable)

A. What This Case Is

This case addresses medical misconduct and continuing harm that:

Is not identical to §1983 claims

May involve different defendants, different duties, or post-county custody harm

Focuses on professional medical standards, not just constitutional minimums

B. Why a Separate Case Is Proper

Medical malpractice and professional liability claims:

TRULINCS 07405510 - LYNCH, JASON M - Unit: ERE-D-A

Have distinct elements

Require different proof

Are governed by different statutes and defenses

Courts routinely require separation to avoid prejudice and confusion

This case protects Lynch's right to full redress for medical harm beyond constitutional thresholds.

WHY ALL THREE CASES MAY PROCEED AT THE SAME TIME

1. No Claim Preclusion (Res Judicata)

Res judicata requires:

Same parties

Same claims

Same court of competent jurisdiction

None of those are fully met here.

Each case:

Involves different legal rights

Seeks different remedies

Invokes different sovereign authority

2. No Improper Claim Splitting

Federal law explicitly allows:

Parallel federal and state proceedings

Concurrent jurisdiction over different causes of action

England v. Louisiana State Bd. of Med. Exam'rs, 375 U.S. 411 (1964)

Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477 (1994) (distinguishing tort, civil rights, and collateral claims)

3. Different Rights, Different Harms

TRULINCS 07405510 - LYNCH, JASON M - Unit: ERE-D-A

Case	Protects	Focus
------	----------	-------

Federal Civil Rights	Constitutional minimums	Abuse of state power
State Tort Case	Personal dignity & safety	Emotional & physical harm
Medical Accountability Case	Professional standards	Long-term health damage

WHY THE COURTS MUST HEAR ALL THREE

Constitutional violations do not erase tort liability

Tort damages do not replace constitutional accountability

Medical negligence claims do not merge into civil rights claims

Each court has:

A non-delegable duty

Exclusive jurisdiction over its respective claims

Dismissing or merging them would deny Lynch full access to justice.

CONCLUSION (CLEAR AND STRONG)

Jason Matthew Lynch is not abusing the courts.
He is doing exactly what the law permits and requires to fully vindicate:

His federal constitutional rights

His state-law personal injury rights

His medical and human dignity rights

Each case:

Is legally distinct

Is filed in the proper court

Seeks non-overlapping remedies

Must be heard on its own merits