

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

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

**IRINA COLLIER, and on behalf of all others simi-
larly situated,
*Plaintiff-Appellant***

v.

**PRESIDENT OF STANFORD, WEBMASTER OF
STANFORD, UCB CHANCELLOR, COLLIER-
GARBER FAMILY, MARC TESSRER-LAVIGNE,
Webmaster of Stanford, CHARLES WADE
COLLIER, CHANCELLOR CHRIST, PRESIDENT
DRAKE,
*Defendants-Appellees***

2023-1185

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Northern District of California in No. 4:22-cv-05375-YGR,
Judge Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers.

PER CURIAM.

O R D E R

The court dismisses Irina Collier's appeal and related
request for a writ of mandamus for lack of jurisdiction.

Ms. Collier filed a complaint at the United States District Court for the Northern District of California against the above-captioned defendants for alleged civil rights violations and family law matters. On September 30, 2022, a magistrate judge, screening the case under 28 U.S.C. § 1915, recommended that the case be dismissed. Among other filings, Ms. Collier filed a notice of appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. On October 21, 2022, the Ninth Circuit dismissed her appeal as premature. Ninth Circuit Appeal No. 22-16529, ECF No. 4. On November 16, 2022, Ms. Collier filed a notice of appeal with this court.

We lack jurisdiction over this appeal and Ms. Collier's related request for mandamus relief. This court does not have jurisdiction to review decisions of the Ninth Circuit. And while this court does have jurisdiction over certain final decisions of federal district courts—namely, those arising under the patent laws, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(1); or under § 1295(a)(4)(C); or those involving monetary claims against the United States “not exceeding \$10,000 in amount,” 28 U.S.C. § 1346(a)(2), *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(2)—Ms. Collier has asserted no claims within this court's limited subject matter jurisdiction.*

* We note that this is now our fourth decision this year explaining to Ms. Collier the statutory limits of this court's jurisdiction over her civil matters arising from the Northern District of California. *See In re Collier*, No. 2022-165, ECF No. 4 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 18, 2022) (dismissing request for mandamus relief for lack of jurisdiction); *Collier v. Univ. of Cal., Berkeley*, No. 2022-1442, ECF No. 18 (Fed. Cir. June 29, 2022) (dismissing request for mandamus relief for lack of jurisdiction); *Collier v. Univ. of Cal., Berkeley*, No. 2022-1442, ECF No. 15 (Fed. Cir. May 26, 2022) (dismissing False Claims Act appeal for lack of

COLLIER v. PRESIDENT OF STANFORD

3

This court can, under 28 U.S.C. § 1631, transfer an appeal to the regional circuit where the appeal “could have been brought at the time it was filed or noticed.” However, the Ninth Circuit has already held that Ms. Collier cannot yet bring her premature appeal, and we agree, so we dismiss this appeal rather than transfer it.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- (1) The appeal is dismissed.
- (2) Any pending motions are denied as moot.
- (3) Each side shall bear its own costs.

FOR THE COURT

December 30, 2022
Date

/s/ Peter R. Marksteiner
Peter R. Marksteiner
Clerk of Court

jurisdiction). Ms. Collier is thus on notice and expected not to seek this court’s review of cases outside of that limited subject matter jurisdiction, as explained to Ms. Collier in those orders as well as this one.