

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

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

DOROTHY M. HARTMAN,
Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES,
Defendant-Appellee

2022-1955

Appeal from the United States Court of Federal Claims
in No. 1:21-cv-02214-MCW, Senior Judge Mary Ellen Cos-
ter Williams.

ON MOTION

PER CURIAM.

O R D E R

Dorothy M. Hartman submits a document challenging the court's September 16, 2022, notice that her opening brief and appendix are not compliant with the court's rules. The document further argues that she is "owed a Default Judgment by law." ECF No. 15 at 2. Ms. Hartman has since moved to withdraw ECF No. 15, but continues to challenge the notice of non-compliance, ECF No. 17. We

construe Ms. Hartman's filings as a motion to accept her non-conforming opening brief and appendix. We accept Ms. Hartman's non-conforming opening brief and appendix for filing and, after careful review of her submissions, conclude that summary affirmance is appropriate.

The United States Court of Federal Claims dismissed, concluding that Ms. Hartman's "complaint [in this case] is substantively identical to the complaint in her 2020 case that the Court of Federal Claims dismissed 'without leave to replead' and [we] affirmed" in *Hartman v. United States*, No. 2021-1535 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 3, 2021), and any claims that the judges and Government attorneys involved in her 2020 case defamed and discredited her were outside of the court's limited jurisdiction. Dkt. No. 16 at 2–3.

Ms. Hartman's submissions provide no cognizable, non-frivolous argument that the Court of Federal Claims erred in dismissing her complaint. The trial court correctly recognized that she is precluded from relitigating claims previously raised (and resolved) in *Hartman*, No. 2021-1535, ECF No. 44. And the trial court was clearly correct that it generally lacks jurisdiction over tort claims, 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1), and claims "against individual federal officials," *Brown v. United States*, 105 F.3d 621, 624 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

We therefore summarily affirm. *Joshua v. United States*, 17 F.3d 378, 380 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (holding that "summary disposition 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,

HARTMAN v. US

3

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- (1) Ms. Hartman's opening brief and appendix, ECF No. 12, are accepted for filing.
- (2) The Court of Federal Claims' judgment dismissing Ms. Hartman's claims is summarily affirmed.
- (3) Any other pending motions are denied as moot.
- (4) Each party shall bear its own costs.

FOR THE COURT

November 9, 2022
Date

/s/ Peter R. Marksteiner
Peter R. Marksteiner
Clerk of Court