

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

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

DERRICK MIKE ALLEN,
Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF NORTH
CAROLINA, JOSH STEIN, in his official capacity as
Governor of North Carolina, ROY COOPER, in his
official capacity as former Governor of North Caro-
lina, JEFF JACKSON, in his official capacity as
North Carolina Attorney General, JUDITH A.
FORTNEY, THE MAYOR OF RALEIGH, RALEIGH'S
CITY CLERK, RALEIGH'S TOWN/CITY MANAGER,
RALEIGH POLICE DEPARTMENT, WAKE COUNTY
DETENTION CENTER**
Defendants

2025-1684

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
District of Columbia in No. 1:25-cv-00844-UNA.

ON MOTION

PER CURIAM.

O R D E R

Derrick Mike Allen moves for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”), ECF No. 4, and submits his informal opening and reply briefs but has not responded to the court’s May 28, 2025 show cause order directing him to address our jurisdiction.

Mr. Allen filed a complaint against the United States and state and local officials and entities in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, demanding “six sextillion dollars” based on his imprisonment. Complaint at 5. He also moved the district court for leave to proceed IFP. On March 26, 2025, the district court ordered Mr. Allen to provide a certified copy of his prison trust account statement or to inform the court that he was no longer in custody. Mr. Allen then filed a notice of appeal directed to this court from “the Decision of the United States District Judge.” ECF No. 1-2 at 1. His motion for IFP before the district court remains pending.

This appeal does not fall within the limited authority that Congress granted this court to review decisions of federal district courts. That jurisdiction extends only to cases arising under the patent laws, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(1); civil actions on review to the district court from the United States Patent and Trademark Office, *see id.* § 1295(a)(4)(C); or certain damages claims against the United States “not exceeding \$10,000 in amount,” *id.* § 1346(a)(2), *see id.* § 1295(a)(2). While 28 U.S.C. § 1631 authorizes this court to transfer a case to another appropriate court, here such transfer would not be appropriate at least because Mr. Allen is seeking review of an order that is clearly interlocutory and not appealable to any court. *C.f. Roberts v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for N. Dist. of Cal.*, 339 U.S. 844, 845 (1950) (holding that *denial* of an IFP motion is an appealable order).

Accordingly,

ALLEN v. US

3

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- (1) The appeal is dismissed.
- (2) ECF No. 4 is denied.
- (3) The parties shall bear their own costs.

FOR THE COURT



Jarrett B. Perlow
Clerk of Court

August 12, 2025
Date