

Docket # \_\_\_\_\_

---

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

Kenneth Leslie Caldwell - PETITIONER

VS.

United States - RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

---

APPENDIX A, FOR PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Kenneth Leslie Caldwell

(Name)

P.O. Box 583, Wendover, UT 84083

(Mailing Address only, no home)

(716)-534-9868

(Phone)

2017emailforward@gmail.com

(Email)

APPENDIX A

**" Capital Case " / " Capital Case Possible "**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

APPENDIX A

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX A.....A1-A98

INDEX TO APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

...ORDER OF DOCKET # 24-1122, U.S. COURT OF  
APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT.....A1-A3

...ORDER OF DOCKET # 24-1122, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS.....A4-A5

...ORDER OF DOCKET # 23-320, U.S. COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS.....A6

...OPINION AND ORDER OF DOCKET # 23-320, U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS.....A7-A9

...JUDGMENT OF DOCKET # 23-320, U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS.....A10

...OPINION OF JUDGE HUSKY, WITH JUDGE GRATTON AND JUDGE  
BRAILSFORD CONCURRING, DOCKET # 49782 COURT OF  
APPEALS OF IDAHO.....A11-A15

...VARIOUS ORDERS AND JUDGMENTS OF IDAHO DISTRICT COURT INCLUDING  
VENUE CHANGE, SUMMARY JUDGMENT, DISMISSAL,  
AND DENIAL OF MONETARY RELIEF, DOCKET # CV10-22-1275.....A16-A33

...ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR REVIEW, DOCKET # 49782-2022,  
SUPREME COURT OF IDAHO.....A34

...REMITTITUR, DOCKET # 49782-2022; SUPREME/APPEALS COURT OF

IDAHO.....	A35
...ORDER OF DOCKET # 24-1122, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, DENYING LEAVE TO FILE AMENDED RESPONSE, TREATING OBJECTION VIA LETTER(TO JUDGE) AS A GRANTED PETITION FOR REHEARING.....	A36-A37
...ORDER OF DOCKET # 24-1122, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, DENYING PETITION FOR REHEARING.....	A38-A39
...TWO PAGES OF COMPLAINT, SUBMITTED TO IDAHO DISTRICT COURT ON 1/18/2022 WITH UNITED STATES CODE AND UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION MENTIONED IN PARAGRAPH 20.....	A40-A41
...TABLE OF CASES AND AUTHORITIES FOR APPELLANT’S BRIEF OF DOCKET #49782, IDAHO SUPREME COURT, SHOWING UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION MENTIONED AND SWATH OF RELEVANT CASELAW.....	A42-A45
...PAGE 2 OF INFORMAL BRIEF FOR DOCKET # 24-1122, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, SHOWING REFERENCE TO THE UNITED STATES CODE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.....	A46
...OBJECTION VIA LETTER, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, # 24-1122.....	A47-A49
...PAGES 401-407 OF DOC 1-2 OF DOCKET # 24-1122 OF U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, UN-HIGHLIGHTED CLEARER COPIES MAY BE AVAILABLE AS DOCUMENT 11 OF DOCKET # 23-320 IN U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS.....	A50-A56
...PAGES 370-395 OF DOC 1-2 OF DOCKET # 24-1122 OF U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, UN-HIGHLIGHTED CLEARER COPIES MAY BE AVAILABLE AS DOCUMENT 10-1 OF DOCKET # 23-320 IN U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS OR	

AS PETITION FOR REVIEW AND BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITION  
OF DOCKET # 49782-2022 IN SUPREME COURT OF IDAHO.....A57-A82

...PAGES 399-400 OF DOC 1-2 OF DOCKET # 24-1122 OF U.S. COURT OF  
APPEALS, UN-HIGHLIGHTED CLEARER COPIES MAY BE AVAILABLE AS  
DOCUMENT 10 OF DOCKET # 23-320 IN U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS, MOTION  
FOR COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL.....A83-A84

...PAGE 309 OF DOC 1-2 OF DOCKET # 24-1122 OF U.S. COURT OF  
APPEALS, UN-HIGHLIGHTED CLEARER COPIES MAY BE AVAILABLE  
AS R Vol. II, p. 167 OF DOCKET # 49782 OF SUPREME COURT OF IDAHO,  
AFFIDAVIT ABOUT THE N-WORD.....A85

...PAGES 282-287 OF DOC 1-2 OF DOCKET # 24-1122 OF U.S. COURT OF  
APPEALS, UN-HIGHLIGHTED CLEARER COPIES MAY BE AVAILABLE AS R  
Vol. II, p. 17-22 OF DOCKET # 49782 OF SUPREME COURT OF IDAHO,  
BRUTALITIES/CASUALTIES AFTER NEWS MEDIA LIED.....A86-A91

...PAGES 138-143, and 126 OF DOC 1-2 OF DOCKET # 24-1122 OF U.S. COURT OF  
APPEALS, UN-HIGHLIGHTED CLEARER COPIES MAY BE AVAILABLE AS R  
Vol. II, p. 17-22 OF DOCKET # 49782 OF SUPREME COURT OF IDAHO,  
AFFIDAVITS SUBMITTED TO DISTRICT COURT OF IDAHO FOLLOWED  
BY THE FIRST PAGE OF MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTIONS.....A92-A98

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED**

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Documents from Docket # 24-1122 in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.....	A1-A5, A36-A39, A46-A98
Documents from Docket # 23-320 in the United States Court of Federal Claims.....	A6-A10
Documents from Docket # 49782 in the Supreme/Appeals Court of Idaho.....	A11-A15, A34-A35, A42-A45
Documents from the Record of Docket # 49782-2022 in the Supreme Court of Idaho.....	A16-A33, A40-A41

The copies of documents/illustrations within this Appendix A are intended to represent exact information of what the certified/authenticated copies from the Clerk's Office(s) may show, and inquiry for certified/authenticated copies from the Clerk's Office(s) may be done to prove exactness.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth Caldwell

Date: 4/27/2024

Name: Kenneth Leslie Caldwell

Mailing Address only (no home): P.O. Box 583, Wendover, UT 84083

Phone: (716)534-9868

Email: 2017emailforward@gmail.com

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

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

---

**KENNETH LESLIE CALDWELL,**  
*Plaintiff-Appellant*

v.

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

---

2024-1122

---

Appeal from the United States Court of Federal Claims  
in No. 1:23-cv-00320-SSS, Judge Stephen S. Schwartz.

---

**ON MOTION**

---

PER CURIAM.

**ORDER**

Kenneth Leslie Caldwell appeals from the judgment of the United States Court of Federal Claims dismissing his complaint. The United States moves for summary affirmance. ECF No. 12. Mr. Caldwell opposes, submits his opening brief, and moves for various relief, including “emergency relief to be determined by [the] court,” ECF No. 6 at 1; for expedited restitution of at least \$80,000, ECF No.

**APPENDIX A**

Page 'A1'

8-1 at 3; summary judgment, ECF No. 10-1; and “\$1,000,000 as a permanent injunction,” ECF No. 17-1 at 2.

Mr. Caldwell previously sued the Judicial Administration of Idaho and Idaho-based media companies in Idaho state court. After that suit was unsuccessful, he filed the underlying complaint at the Court of Federal Claims, alleging the Judicial Administration of Idaho as well as other state and federal officials and entities violated various laws, including provisions of U.S. Code title 18 (criminal code); U.S. Code title 42 (civil rights); 10 U.S.C. §§ 251–254; the First, Fourth, Fifth, Eighth, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, and antitrust laws. Mr. Caldwell also requested that the Court of Federal Claims compel the Patent and Trademark Office to grant him intellectual property rights to 28 “ideas” he identified in his complaint. The Court of Federal Claims granted the government’s motion to dismiss the complaint. This appeal followed.

The Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1491, limits the jurisdiction of the Court of Federal Claims to claims for money damages against the United States based on sources of substantive law that “can fairly be interpreted as mandating compensation by the Federal Government.” *United States v. Navajo Nation*, 556 U.S. 287, 290 (2009) (citation omitted). For the reasons explained in the Court of Federal Claims’s Opinion and Order, none of the sources of law identified in the complaint were shown to create a right to monetary damages against the United States.\* And while

---

\* Although the complaint generally referenced the Fifth Amendment, the Court of Federal Claims correctly explained that Mr. Caldwell did not allege any taking of property that could plausibly support a claim under the Takings Clause and the trial court lacks jurisdiction over any alleged violation of the Due Process Clause. *See LeBlanc v. United States*, 50 F.3d 1025, 1028 (Fed. Cir. 1995).



CALDWELL v. US

3

28 U.S.C. § 1498 authorizes the trial court to award damages for the use or manufacture of a covered patent or copyright by or on behalf of the United States, Mr. Caldwell's complaint failed to identify any issued patent or copyright to support such a claim.

We have considered Mr. Caldwell's arguments in his brief, but find they fail to raise a non-frivolous basis for error. Accordingly, summary affirmance is appropriate here because there is no "substantial question regarding the outcome" of the appeal. *Joshua v. United States*, 17 F.3d 378, 380 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (citation omitted).

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

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

FOR THE COURT



Jarrett B. Perlow  
Clerk of Court

February 5, 2024  
Date

A3

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

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

---

**KENNETH LESLIE CALDWELL,**  
*Plaintiff-Appellant*

v.

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

---

2024-1122

---

Appeal from the United States Court of Federal Claims  
in No. 1:23-cv-00320-SSS, Judge Stephen S. Schwartz.

---

**ON MOTION**

---

PER CURIAM.

**ORDER**

On February 10, 2024, Kenneth Leslie Caldwell moved for leave to file an amended response to the motion for summary affirmance [ECF No. 21].

On February 13, 2024, Mr. Caldwell filed a document, with attachments, entitled "Objection to Document 20 via Letter" [ECF No. 22].

Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

(1) ECF No. 21 is denied.

(2) ECF No. 22 is construed as a petition for panel rehearing and is accepted for filing as such. The petition for panel rehearing will be considered in due course.

FOR THE COURT



Jarrett B. Perlow  
Clerk of Court

February 22, 2024  
Date

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

No. 23-320C

(Filed: August 31, 2023)

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

\*\*\*\*\*

KENNETH LESLIE CALDWELL, \*

Plaintiff, \*

v. \*

THE UNITED STATES, \*

Defendant. \*

\*\*\*\*\*

## OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiff Kenneth Leslie Caldwell, proceeding *pro se*, makes a variety of allegations and seeks various forms of relief. *See* Complaint (ECF 1). The government has moved to dismiss under RCFC 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6).<sup>1</sup> The motion to dismiss is **GRANTED**.

The Tucker Act limits this Court’s subject-matter jurisdiction — its authority to pass judgment on the cases before it — to specific types of claims, most commonly non-tort claims for money damages. *See, e.g.*, 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1); *see also Brown v. United States*, 105 F.3d 621, 623 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (“The Court of Federal Claims is a court of limited jurisdiction.”).<sup>2</sup> Perhaps confusingly for *pro se* litigants, it is not a forum for “federal claims” generally. Claims that are outside the Court’s jurisdiction must be dismissed. RCFC 12(h)(3). “In determining jurisdiction, a court must accept as true all undisputed facts asserted in the plaintiff’s complaint and draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the plaintiff.” *Trusted Integration, Inc. v. United States*, 659 F.3d 1159, 1163 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (citing *Henke v. United States*, 60 F.3d 795, 797 (Fed. Cir. 1995)). “Although a *pro se* plaintiff’s complaint is held to a less stringent standard than those prepared by counsel, *pro se* litigants are not excused from meeting jurisdictional requirements.” *Spengler v. United States*, 688 F. App’x 917, 920 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (citations omitted) (citing *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9

<sup>1</sup> *See* Mot. to Dismiss (ECF 12). Mr. Caldwell has filed a response (ECF 15), and the government has filed a reply (ECF 18).

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Caldwell mentions jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1505, but he has not pleaded that he is an Indian or represents an Indian group.

(1980), and *Kelley v. Sec’y, U.S. Dep’t of Labor*, 812 F.2d 1378, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 1987)); see also *Howard-Pinson v. United States*, 74 Fed. Cl. 551, 553 (2006) (explaining that *pro se* litigants are “entitled to a liberal construction of [their] pleadings”) (citing *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520–21 (1972)).

Most of Mr. Caldwell’s claims involve misconduct by Idaho state agencies, courts, and officers, or by individuals and businesses. This Court, though, cannot hear claims against defendants other than the United States, and it cannot review the decisions of other courts. *Innovair Aviation Ltd. v. United States*, 632 F.3d 1336, 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2011); *Jones v. United States*, 440 F. App’x 916, 918 (Fed. Cir. 2011); *Joshua v. United States*, 17 F.3d 378, 380 (Fed. Cir. 1994); see also *Vehr v. United States*, 117 Fed. Cl. 332, 333 (2014). This Court has no jurisdiction over claims based on state law. *Cabral v. United States*, 317 F. App’x 979, 982 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (citing *Souders v. S.C. Pub. Serv. Auth.*, 497 F.3d 1303, 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2007)).

Mr. Caldwell claims that certain federal agencies have failed to prevent misconduct by the state, see Complaint at 3, and he refers to alleged rights under several federal laws, see, e.g., *id.* at 30–35. Claims for money in this Court, though, are generally premised on (1) contracts between the plaintiff and the United States or (2) laws or constitutional provisions that require the United States to pay money to the plaintiff. *Fisher v. United States*, 402 F.3d 1167, 1172 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1)). He mentions no contract with the United States, and he has not shown that any other federal law he mentions creates rights to money in this Court. Binding or persuasive authority forecloses his claims as to most of those laws. See, e.g., *Jones*, 440 F. App’x at 918 (criminal laws); *Duncan v. United States*, 446 F. App’x 303, 305 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (18 U.S.C. § 3771); *Stephens v. United States*, No. 10-571C, 2011 WL 222118, at \*3 (Fed. Cl. Jan. 21, 2011) (42 U.S.C. §§ 1981–1986); *Class v. United States*, No. 20-205, 2020 WL 3960342, at \*4 (Fed. Cl. July 13, 2020) (10 U.S.C. § 253); *United States v. Connolly*, 716 F.2d 882, 887 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (First Amendment); *Brown*, 105 F.3d at 623 (Fourth Amendment); *Trafny v. United States*, 503 F.3d 1339, 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (Eighth Amendment); *Starnes v. United States*, 162 Fed. Cl. 468, 474 (2022) (Thirteenth Amendment); *Greene v. United States*, No. 22-1711C, 2023 WL 3454821, at \*2 (Fed. Cl. May 15, 2023) (Fourteenth Amendment); *Hufford v. United States*, 87 Fed. Cl. 696, 703 (2009) (antitrust laws). Individuals can pursue compensation for takings of property in this Court under the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution, *Acceptance Ins. Cos. Inc. v. United States*, 503 F.3d 1328, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2007), but Mr. Caldwell does not allege that any of his property was taken.

The only claims in the complaint that might relate to the United States involve disputes over intellectual property — specifically, Mr. Caldwell’s efforts to obtain

various patents and trademarks. Those claims seek non-monetary relief, *see* Complaint at 15, 25, which is outside this Court's authority to grant except "as an incident of and collateral to" a money judgment. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(2); *see also* *United States v. Tohono O'Odham Nation*, 563 U.S. 307, 313 (2011) ("[T]he [Court of Federal Claims] has no general power to provide equitable relief against the Government or its officers."). To the extent Mr. Caldwell's claims involve trademarks, "no statute gives the Court of Federal Claims jurisdiction over trademark claims." *Siler v. United States*, 296 F. App'x 32, 33 (Fed. Cir. 2008). Although this Court can grant relief for infringement of patents by the United States, 28 U.S.C. § 1498(a), Mr. Caldwell does not claim that he ever obtained any relevant patents or trademarks. This Court has no jurisdiction over claims related to unissued patents, *Stroughter v. United States*, 89 Fed. Cl. 755, 761–62 (2009), let alone trademarks. To the extent Mr. Caldwell objects to the non-issuance of patents or trademarks, those claims belong in other forums. *See, e.g.*, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1070, 1071, 1121; 35 U.S.C. §§ 134, 141, 145. Claims involving other intellectual property-related administrative actions may be governed by the Administrative Procedure Act, but this Court lacks jurisdiction over those claims as well. *Martinez v. United States*, 333 F.3d 1295, 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

I have reviewed Plaintiff's complaint in its entirety, and I am unable to identify any claims within this Court's jurisdiction. Defendant's motion to dismiss is **GRANTED** and the case is **DISMISSED**, without prejudice, for lack of jurisdiction. *See Aerolineas Argentinas v. United States*, 77 F.3d 1564, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996) ("[I]n the absence of subject matter jurisdiction there can be no preclusive findings or conclusions on the merits, and dismissal for lack of jurisdiction is without prejudice."). The procedural requests mentioned in Mr. Caldwell's response to the motion to dismiss are **DENIED AS MOOT**. Mr. Caldwell's motion to appoint counsel (ECF 10) and motion for appointment of a special master and injunctive relief (ECF 11) are likewise **DENIED AS MOOT**.

The Clerk is directed to enter judgment accordingly.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Stephen S. Schwartz  
STEPHEN S. SCHWARTZ  
Judge

**In the United States Court of Federal Claims**

**No. 23-320 C**

**Filed: August 31, 2023**

**KENNETH LESLIE CALDWELL**  
**Plaintiff**

**v.**

**JUDGMENT**

**THE UNITED STATES**  
**Defendant**

Pursuant to the court's Opinion and Order, filed August 31, 2023, granting defendant's motion to dismiss,

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED this date, pursuant to Rule 58, that plaintiff's complaint is dismissed, without prejudice, for lack of jurisdiction.

Lisa L. Reyes  
Clerk of Court

By: *Debra L. Samler*

Deputy Clerk

**NOTE:** As to appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, 60 days from this date, see RCFC 58.1, re number of copies and listing of all plaintiffs. Filing fee is \$505.00.

**A10**