

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

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

---

**SCOTT GENE YAHNE,**  
*Plaintiff-Appellant*

**v.**

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

---

2026-1827

---

Appeal from the United States Court of Federal Claims  
in No. 1:25-cv-01881-SSS, Judge Stephen S. Schwartz.

---

**ON MOTION**

---

PER CURIAM.

**O R D E R**

The United States moves to summarily affirm the judgment of the United States Court of Federal Claims dismissing Scott Gene Yahne's complaint. Mr. Yahne submits a notice requesting relief on the merits. We now grant the United States's motion.

Mr. Yahne filed this suit against the United States "d/b/a" as "IRS Agent John Does 1-100," the California

Franchise Tax Board, an Assistant Attorney General, a United States attorney, an “ACS Support” operations manager, and a district court judge and the Clerk of Court of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. ECF No. 3 at A9. He alleged “unfair and deceptive trade practices . . . addressed by various consumer protection laws” and “breach of contract” with the Department of Treasury for “financial instrument processing, Bonds[.]” *Id.* at A10, A13–A14. In his opposition to the government’s motion to dismiss, he elaborated that his birth certificate has a “currency value” over one billion dollars. Dkt. No. 16-1 at 34, *see also id.* at 38. The trial court dismissed for lack of jurisdiction and for failure to state a claim for relief.

We agree with the government that summary affirmance is appropriate because dismissal here was “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). The Court of Federal Claims was clearly correct that claims aimed at parties other than the United States and claims for unfair and deceptive trade practices sounding in tort fall outside its limited jurisdiction. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1); *United States v. Sherwood*, 312 U.S. 584, 588 (1941). The Court of Federal Claims was also clearly correct in dismissing the remainder of the action, as Mr. Yahne’s complaint did not plead facts supporting a plausible inference that he was in contractual privity with the United States or otherwise had any cognizable claim within the court’s jurisdiction.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

(1) The United States’s motion is granted. The Court of Federal Claims’s judgment is summarily affirmed.

YAHNE v. US

3

- (2) Relief requested by Mr. Yahne is denied.
- (3) Each party shall bear its own costs.

FOR THE COURT



Jarrett B. Perlow  
Clerk of Court

July 30, 2026  
Date