NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

# United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

---

**NATHAN E. JACOBS,**
*Plaintiff-Appellant*

**v.**

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

---

2026-2149

---

Appeal from the United States Court of Federal Claims in No. 1:26-cv-00847-PSH, Judge Philip S. Hadji.

---

**ON MOTION**

---

PER CURIAM.

**O R D E R**

Nathan E. Jacobs filed a complaint at the United States Court of Federal Claims seeking damages and for his criminal conviction to be "eradicated from all National and International System[s] of Records and Files." ECF

No. 3 at Appx8.[1] The Court of Federal Claims dismissed for lack of jurisdiction, and Mr. Jacobs appeals. The United States now moves for summary affirmance. Mr. Jacobs has not responded to the motion.

Summary disposition 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 Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1491, grants the Court of Federal Claims jurisdiction only over claims for money damages against the United States government based on money-mandating sources of law. *See United States v. Navajo Nation*, 556 U.S. 287, 290 (2009). It has no authority to review his criminal conviction or grant the relief requested here. *See generally Joshua*, 17 F.3d at 379 ("The court has no jurisdiction to adjudicate any claims whatsoever under the federal criminal code . . . ."). Because Mr. Jacobs clearly failed to assert a claim within the limited jurisdiction of the trial court, we summarily affirm.[2]

Accordingly,

---

[1] According to the trial court's decision, Mr. Jacobs included with his complaint "correspondence and documents related to prior proceedings in other courts, including an arrest warrant, criminal complaint, and judgment filed in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan." ECF No. 3 at Appx2.

[2] While Mr. Jacobs's complaint generally asserted "[t]his is an ongoing 'open ending contract' to be resolved in the People's Court," ECF No. 3 at Appx8, he made no nonfrivolous allegation that could give the Court of Federal Claims jurisdiction over his complaint. *See Hercules Inc. v. United States*, 516 U.S. 417, 423 (1996) (explaining that alleged implied-in-law contracts are outside the court's jurisdiction).

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

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

(2) Each party shall bear its own costs.

FOR THE COURT

Jarrett B. Perlow
Clerk of Court

September 22, 2026
Date