

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

SANJA LJUTIC,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES,
Defendant-Appellee.

2014-5109

Appeal from the United States Court of Federal Claims in No. 1:14-cv-00182-EJD, Judge Edward J. Damich.

ON MOTION

PER CURIAM.

O R D E R

Sanja Ljutic, a resident of Bosnia and Herzegovina, brought this complaint seeking action against the President of the United States. Ljutic raised various grievances and asked for “impeachment” and the “formation of a special crises government,” as well as “\$14,900,000” in lost salary. The Court of Federal Claims dismissed the complaint for lack of jurisdiction. The government thinks

that decision is clearly correct as a matter of law, and so do we.

The Tucker Act limits the jurisdiction of the Court of Federal Claims to claims for money damages against the United States based on sources of substantive law that “can fairly be interpreted as mandating compensation by the Federal Government.” *United States v. Navajo Nation*, 556 U.S. 287, 290 (2009). The Court of Federal Claims correctly pointed out in its dismissal order that Ljutic’s complaint does not point to any money-mandating provision that could give the Court of Federal Claims jurisdiction or relate in any manner to the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

Because the decision to dismiss the complaint for lack of jurisdiction was clearly correct, we agree with the government’s motion that summary affirmance is appropriate. *See Joshua v. United States*, 17 F.3d 378, 380 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (Summary affirmance of a case “is appropriate, *inter alia*, when the position of one party is so clearly correct as a matter of law that no substantial question regarding the outcome of the appeal exists.”).

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- (1) The motion for summary affirmance is granted.
- (2) Each side shall bear its own costs.

FOR THE COURT

/s/ Daniel E. O’Toole
Daniel E. O’Toole
Clerk of Court