NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

SHATWAYLLA YOUMANS,
Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES,
Defendant-Appellee

2026-1350

Appeal from the United States Court of Federal Claims in No. 1:25-cv-01902-EDK, Judge Elaine Kaplan.

Decided: September 14, 2026

SHATWAYLLA YOUMANS, Phoenix, AZ, pro se.

OLIVER MCDONALD, Commercial Litigation Branch, Civil Division, United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for defendant-appellee. Also represented by ERIC P. BRUSKIN, PATRICIA M. MCCARTHY, BRETT SHUMATE.

Before MOORE, *Chief Judge*, PROST and TARANTO, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

Shatwaylla Youmans appeals an order of the Court of Federal Claims dismissing her complaint for lack of jurisdiction. Because none of Ms. Youmans' allegations states a non-frivolous claim cognizable under the Tucker Act, we *affirm*.

BACKGROUND

In November 2025, Ms. Youmans filed a complaint in the Court of Federal Claims, accusing a wide variety of state and federal officials of a range of serious crimes, including fraud, waste, identity theft, wrongful imprisonment, torture, attempted murder, illicit experimentation on human beings, battery by intentional communication of a variety of transmissible diseases (like Covid-19, AIDS, and tuberculosis), conspiracy with the Mexican drug cartel, and unlawful seizure of her daughter's blood plasma. *See generally* S.Appx. 4–35[1] (Complaint). Ms. Youmans requested half a billion dollars in relief. *Id.* at 6.

The Court of Federal Claims dismissed Ms. Youmans' complaint sua sponte for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. S.Appx. 1; *see also* Rule 12(h)(3)[2]. The court grouped Ms. Youmans' claims into three categories and concluded none was within its jurisdiction because: (1) her fraud and money-mismanagement claims failed to identify a money-mandating source of law; (2) her claims against state officials and agencies either failed to implicate the United States or sounded in tort or criminal law; and (3) her averment that the Treasury Department miscalculated her social security benefits and wrongfully requested

---

[1] "S.Appx." refers to the supplemental appendix attached to Appellee's Brief.

[2] "Rule" refers to the Rules of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

repayment was a matter exclusively committed to the district courts' jurisdiction. S.Appx. 2. Ms. Youmans appeals. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(3).

DISCUSSION

We review de novo a Court of Federal Claims dismissal for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. *Res. Cons. Grp., LLC v. United States*, 597 F.3d 1238, 1242 (Fed. Cir. 2010). Under the Tucker Act, the United States has consented to suit for "any claim against the United States founded either upon the Constitution, or any Act of Congress or any regulation of an executive department, . . . or for liquidated or unliquidated damages in cases not sounding in tort." 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1). Claims against the United States that are "frivolous, wholly insubstantial, or made solely for the purpose of obtaining jurisdiction" will not give rise to jurisdiction. *Columbus Reg'l Hosp. v. United States*, 990 F.3d 1330, 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2021). Although we afford pro se plaintiffs more latitude in pleading, they still must establish jurisdiction by a preponderance of the evidence. *E.g.*, *Roman v. United States*, 61 F.4th 1366, 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2023).

On appeal, Ms. Youmans argues the Court of Federal Claims failed to take into account "[a]ll facts submitted within the case," "did not specify the correct due process of court proceedings," and failed to consider "[t]he [f]acts of [l]aw of unlawful [a]cts, illegal [a]cts committed." Appellant Br. 1–2. She reiterates many of the allegations she made in her complaint. *See generally*, Reply Br. 2–30, 32–51.[3] She further contends the Court of Federal Claims judge should have recused herself and that the judge committed treason by dismissing Ms. Youmans' complaint. *Id.*

---

[3] Due to inconsistent pagination, pin citations to Ms. Youmans' reply brief refer to PDF page numbers of ECF No. 12.

at 9–11, 13–15 (alleging judicial misconduct by "not enforc[ing] the duties of law"). We interpret Ms. Youmans' appeal as challenging the decision on the merits and arguing the judge should have recused herself as a matter of due process.

As an initial matter, Ms. Youmans failed to seek recusal below. Accordingly, that argument is unavailable to her on appeal. *In re Google Tech. Holdings LLC*, 980 F.3d 858, 862 (Fed. Cir. 2020) ("[F]orfeiture is the failure to make the timely assertion of a right." (quotation marks omitted)). In any case, her due-process argument fails because her challenges seem to be limited to the fact that the decision was adverse to her. *See Helfer v. West*, 174 F.3d 1332, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (explaining that simply putting a "due process" label on a claim does not raise "a separate constitutional contention" distinct from a dispute about the merits); *see also, e.g.*, Reply Br. 13–15. Ms. Youmans' accusations of misconduct reflect nothing more than her disagreement with the outcome. *See, e.g.*, Reply Br. 10–11 (arguing, without support, that "Judge [Kaplan] is unqualified and should be investigated for TREASON[sic]"); *see also id.* at 38–39. We conclude Ms. Youmans failed to establish a due-process deprivation.

On the merits, we agree with the Court of Federal Claims' dismissal. Ms. Youmans alleges the Treasury Department committed fraud and waste by paying others (who largely consist of immigrants of African and Latin American descent whom she dubs "adversaries") more than her. *See, e.g.*, S.Appx. 12–18. Not only does this fail to identify a money-mandating source of law, as the Court of Federal Claims correctly concluded, but it also does not make a non-frivolous allegation against the United States. *See Oneida Indian Nation of N.Y. State v. Oneida Cnty.*, 414 U.S. 661, 666–67 (1974) (explaining no jurisdiction exists when "basis for petitioners' assertion" is "completely devoid of merit as not to involve a federal controversy"). Ms. Youmans' claims against state officials and agencies

cannot be maintained in the Court of Federal Claims for the same reason. *United States v. Sherwood*, 312 U.S. 584, 588 (1941). And we agree with the Court of Federal Claims that it lacks jurisdiction to hear complaints about social security benefits. *Marcus v. United States*, 909 F.2d 1470, 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

CONCLUSION

We have considered Ms. Youmans' remaining arguments and find them unpersuasive. Accordingly, we *affirm*.

AFFIRMED

COSTS

No costs.