

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
No. 05-577C
(Filed July 25, 2005)

*
STANLEY BAKER, *
*
Plaintiff, *
*
v. *
*
THE UNITED STATES, *
*
Defendant. *
*

ORDER

On July 8, 2005, the Court dismissed for want of jurisdiction the complaint filed by the plaintiff Stanley Baker. On July 18, 2005, the plaintiff submitted a document to the Court which he styles as a Rule 60 motion and which the Court construes as a timely motion for reconsideration (“Pl.’s Mot. Recon.”) under Rule 59 of the Rules of the United States Court of Federal Claims. This document is inscrutable. Mr. Baker has appended to it copies of a 1988 Veterans Administration compensation and pension application, a copy of prepared statements made before the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, a copy of this Court’s July 8, 2005 dismissal order, a copy of an order to show cause from the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Columbia, and two copies of a check made payable to Mr. Baker from an investment firm.

Nothing in this new submission changes the Court’s previous opinion that, whatever the plaintiff’s claims might be, this Court lacks jurisdiction to hear them. Mister Baker appears to be concerned about “war crimes” and a debt concerning an Elmore County that may have been discharged in bankruptcy. Typical of the language is the following assertion of sorts: “Whereas All American have the Civil Right not be with or apart of person in gain in War against United States of American. it’s is so United States replace the Sum of 5,600.00 As a Claim against U.S for Allowing Security Contract with Know enemy of the State and United States” Pl.’s Mot. Recon. ¶ 18. It is impossible to tell just what contract Mister Baker is referencing, but it is not a contract between him and the United States. Nor does he identify any of his property that might have been taken by the United States government, or any money that the federal government illegally exacted from him, or owes him under a money-mandating statute of any kind.

Because the Court lacks jurisdiction over any of the claims advanced by the plaintiff, his motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

VICTOR J. WOLSKI
Judge