

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

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

---

**JOHN DUGAS,**  
*Plaintiff-Appellant*

v.

**UNITED STATES,**  
*Defendant-Appellee*

---

2025-1134

---

Appeal from the United States Court of Federal Claims  
in No. 1:24-cv-01485-CNL, Judge Carolyn N. Lerner.

---

**ON MOTION**

---

Before DYK, CUNNINGHAM, and STARK, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

**O R D E R**

John Dugas moves for various relief, including “to expedite emergency request with summary judgment” for “the monetary amount of \$26 Trillion or More.” ECF No. 18 at 2 (cleaned up). The United States moves for summary affirmance. ECF No. 34.

Mr. Dugas filed his complaint at the United States Court of Federal Claims against the City of New York and Departments of City Government alleging they were “operating in a criminal manner.” Dkt. No. 1 at 2. The Court of Federal Claims dismissed the case, concluding that the court lacked jurisdiction over Mr. Dugas’s claims against state and local government entities and his allegations of violations of criminal law.

Summary disposition is appropriate because the Court of Federal Claims’s judgment “is so clearly correct as a matter of law that no substantial question regarding the outcome of the appeal exists.” *Joshua v. United States*, 17 F.3d 378, 380 (Fed. Cir. 1994). For Mr. Dugas’s claims against New York state and local entities, “if the relief sought is against others than the United States the suit as to them must be ignored as beyond the jurisdiction of the [Court of Federal Claims],” *United States v. Sherwood*, 312 U.S. 584, 588 (1941). And for his allegations of violations of criminal law, the Court of Federal Claims “has no jurisdiction to adjudicate any claims whatsoever under the federal criminal code,” *Joshua*, 17 F.3d at 379.

Accordingly,

DUGAS v. US

3

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- (1) The motion for summary affirmance is granted, and the judgment of the United States Court of Federal Claims is summarily affirmed.
- (2) All other motions are denied.
- (3) Each party shall bear its own costs.

FOR THE COURT



Jarrett B. Perlow  
Clerk of Court

January 14, 2025  
Date