IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

DOROTHY M. HARTMAN,

Plaintiff

v.

THE UNITED STATES

Defendant

Case No. 1:20- cv- 00832

Judge Eleni M. Roumel

NOTICE OF APPEAL OR RECONSIDERATION BY THIS COURT TO REOPEN CASE .

1.According to civil , constitutional , and criminal laws of this country , the Plaintiff Pro Se alleges that she has been and continues to be the victim of historically one of the greatest attacks of Domestic Terrorism and Judicial and governmental abuse of Office . With all due respect to the Court of Federal Claims and the apology of the Plaintiff to its Chief Judge Eleni Roumel , the Plaintiff wishes to reopen this case closed by the Memorandum / Order filed by Your Honor on November 16 , 2020 .

2.Absent what errors that may have appeared in her July 6 , 2020 filing , the Plaintiff would like to reiterate her eligible claims that exist under the Big Tucker Act under this Court's jurisdiction in the hopes that she might yet find relief in Law and Justice .

3.Let's consider the Judge's Memorandum /Order filed November 16 , 2020 to examine the parts of the Plaintiff's Complaint that might be salvaged and considered in this appeal as the law is quite specific in noting the rights to which the Plaintiff Pro Se is entitled under the jurisdiction of the court of federal claims-

that jurisdiction best known by the Court . Attached for Reference is the Judge's 8-paged Opinion . To maintain her claims which now are in their 6th year , the Plaintiff Pro Se who is still traumatized by her experiences which include the loss of two homes by what can only be described as a 'fraud fest' carried out by government employees – primarily judges but not limited to Judges acting outside of their role as judges and abusing the privileges of their office .

4.With all due respect to this Court and to Your Honor , the Plaintiff Pro Se asks that she be judged according to her position and that is a plaintiff pro se and not a lawyer who has been forced into that position by those violating their office and committing crimes against the plaintiff . The Plaintiff brought her case before this court, the CFC on July 5 , 2020 having already introduced her case **in a timely manner** to previous District Courts where the final acts of injustice occurred in an effort to maintain the statute of limitations on her claims . The domestic terrorism to which the plaintiff has been subjected which not only involves the loss of two homes which were taken by FRAUD , but the defamation of her good name and reputation including extreme and intentional infliction of distress as she has been under attack by hundreds of individuals online and off while she was already ill . This has left her traumatized . Those violations of the Plaintiff's civil , constitutional , and criminal acts have caused extreme damage to her and because of her age may never recover . Therefore for the sake of Justice , In spite of the Plaintiff Pro Se errors , I hope that Your Honor will reconsider and reopen this case which deserves a look at actual evidence and to hear from witnesses .

5. 3rd Circuit of Appeals and the Federal Circuit Ct. of Appeals .- These Opinions , the Federal Circuit Ct. of Appeals opinion rendered and mandated in April 2013 – a Writ of Mandamus # was filed with the Supreme Court but not reviewed and therefore denied on February 2015 .. Further , in the 3rd Circuit Ct. of Appeals , the Opinion affirmed in Mellon Bank et al vs. Dorothy M. Hartman was handed down on May 5 , 2016 , Hartman filed a Writ of Certiorari #1310187 that was filed with the Supreme Court and therefore denied . These judicial acts were not decades ago but within 6 years and pursuant to 28 U.S. Code § 2501 may still be heard by this Court, the CFC to determine whether the acts by government employees acting against the Plaintiff in ways that seriously harmed her – motivated by racial hatred , prejudice and excessive greed alleges the Plaintiff dictate that the victim should receive Justice and compensation for her loss(es) and suffering .

6. Pursuant to **28 U.S. Code § 2501**, Every claim of which the United States Court of Federal Claims has jurisdiction shall be barred unless the petition thereon is filed

within six years after such claim first accrues. Plaintiff has suffered horrendously and continues trying to live in anguish and therefore asked this court for relief from injustice and cruelty . The fact of the matter is the government has empowered and enriched itself by theft of property and while at the same time cruelly exploiting of the Plaintiff who was a working and law abiding person who purchased nice homes – not a criminal nor a thief but a contributing member of society who contributed a considerable amount of service as well as valuable property through her creativity and skills . Therefore to maintain the statute of limitations of her claims , the Plaintiff respectfully asks that Your Honor , Eleni Roumel reopen her case .

6.Pro Se Plaintiff alleges that she can prove her allegations and claims if given the opportunity to do so . She was not having mortgage problems when her home at 822 So. 5th Street was taken from her through Fraud , a fraudulent mortgage foreclosure and falsified criminal records in the 3rd Circuit Court of Appeals . She lived in an Apartment at 2200 Parkway , Apt. 105 because she could not live in her home because of being harassed and intimidated and had rented her home to tenants . The prejudiced judges , that she refers to as a "lynch mob" who had it in for her because of her lawsuit for fraud and discrimination against a Jew , Dennis Milstein , John D'Angelo , Frank Pryor and Greenwich Walk Homeowners Assn had used its influence . These men where big shots in Philadelphia City Government . Dennis Milstein and his father Howard in Real Estate , John D'Angelo a lawyer and secretary for the Philadelphia Civil Service Commission , and Frank Pryor Police Captain for the 3rd District and apparently 'friends' with the respondents or condominium board . The judge apologized to Mr. D'Angelo for having to bring him to court .

7."Being the first Black and female head of household to purchase a condominium there at that Complex on Philadelphia's South Street – I was insulted with racial and sexual epithets , such as "suck 16 inches "and had been sold a condominium with a leaky bedroom which had been covered up – apparently by the seller bribing the housing inspector . After 4 years of it , I finally sued in 1998 – it was just the beginning of what became a legal nightmare with the ' fix on ' to put the 'niggah in her place' . That was only the beginning of what would become a living hell especially when the trial was fixed with the subpoena for the Housing Inspector was squashed and the fraud became a non suit and the judges did not order the respondents to fix the roof but he did pose the question to the jury as to whether they felt the roof was a defective condition before purchase to which they they all answered "yes" but to prevent the seller from paying punitive damages he had already entered a non suit for fraud. I won the case on a lesser charge of negligence, an $8,000 judgment not $400,000 as they claimed in falsified criminal records ."

8.“ I was forced to move from my condominium at 1105C South Street and purchased 822 So. 5th Street but the mob influenced by city workers and judges continued as they do to this day to harass , threaten , and intimidate .That case as well as others designed to strip me of all of my property rights have followed . Evidence and witnesses can attest to this . I was not having ‘mortgage problems ‘. I was paying rent and a mortgage when they took my house because the troublemakers sent a convicted felon into my home to rob my tenants and tore up my house resulting in $8300 damages. That is what caused me to default and Bank of America which was in on the fraud would not allow me to repair the default in my mortgage even though I had income. I am the victim in this situation – not the defendants or lynch mob and thieves . I lived almost happily in spite of poor health for almost 50 years until my contact with race hating judges , government employees , and politicians who resented my intelligence and accomplishments and they attacked me and took everything that I own and worked for over a lifetime . There are a number of them involved in it . I have a right to defend myself and my property from them and a right for redress for my grievances in a court of law .”

9.“ It consists of a civil conspiracy which may have had its roots in Philadelphia but once they learned in Deposition of my home office , Talk Shoppe Inc. , and my involvement in the development of the Internet – thus began the involvement of others and their *taking of my property* and other cruelty. “ I kept a journal with the Comptroller of the Currency of the outrageous and cruel things done to me and to my property homes and automobiles while being harassed and made to live in a hostile environment . “ Any supposed bad luck in business was caused by destruction of my websites and business start ups online through censure and sabotage of my sites by those who have been gifted with my intellectual property by the government and who along with some of the government employees have been promoted or flourished through profits . Talk Shoppe Inc. is probably the first prototype in history to have a supposedly ‘criminal record ‘. “

10.“These people that I sued were associated with city workers. My experiences are available through the Freedom of Information Act. **See Exhibit 3** and I shared that with the crooked trials that I was subjected to but all judges associated with the take away of my home – ignored evidence and tried to portray me as ‘no good’ with their lies and libel. I have always been quiet and reclusive for the most part because of illness . However besides school , teaching , inventing and taking care of my family – that is the only thing I have done in life . My contributions are nothing to sneeze at and not only do I deserve to be paid for property that they took from me including my homes , and intellectual property , because it was done with politics and hate and nothing legal about it. Soon the mob included Harrisburg , Pa. , Washington D.C. and Alexandria , Va.“

11."My claims can be proven . Thus far I have not had the opportunity to be heard in Court. Therefore I ask this Court to reopen this case , according to its discretion for Cause of Action . I am only a disabled woman . What could I have possibly done to cause all of these people to hurt me ? I have enclosed one of the letters from my personnel file. I was well thought of by my former employers , my colleagues , and my neighbors . I am not aggressive nor a trouble maker . **See Exhibit 1** Even after retirement I spent a great deal of time inventing ideas to help people , not hurt them . I deserve Justice for this situation . I would never had been treated this way had it not been for the resentment to me an African-American a well educated and , articulate woman , racial hatred , and excessive greed surrounding the worth of my property especially what eventually became the new Internet after 1990 . " Therefore I ask the Court to use and exercise its jurisdiction to hear this case because interference with patenting and intellectual property or trade secrets that belong to another is theft especially when done with government employees being in conspiracy with each other and conflicts of interest where they have charge of my property and can do what they like ."

_____ However, a *pro se* plaintiff still has the burden of establishing this Court's jurisdiction by a preponderance of the evidence. *Reynolds*, 846 F.2d at 748; *Curry v. United States*, 787 F. App'x 720, 722 (2019) (citing *Kelly v. Sec'y U.S. Dep't oLabor*, 812 F.2d 1378, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). As with all other litigants, this Court must havejurisdiction over claims brought by *pro se* litigants. *See Reynolds*, 846 F.2d at 748

12.On Appeal or reconsideration , the Plaintiff Pro Se will restrict her allegations and charges to Federal Government Employees although they influenced others, those over whom the Court of Federal Claims does have jurisdiction and concentrate on compensatory damages that because of the subject matter and the illegal acts involved by numerous individuals in the theft of what has become exceedingly valuable property are still considerable . There was no way that I should have been treated the way I was , It was unnecessary , inhumane, and mean. I want the ones responsible to be held accountable ."

"*Function of court on motion is to determine whether genuine issue of*

fact exists." Palmer v. Capitol Life Ins. Co., 157 Neb. 760, 61 N.W.2d 396 (1953).

"*On a motion for summary judgment, the question is not how a factual issue is to be decided, but whether any real issue of material fact exists. Where it is not clear from the record whether the trial court relied upon improper evidence, the better course is to reverse a grant of summary judgment. Summary judgment is an extreme remedy because it may dispose of a crucial question in litigation, or the litigation itself, and may thereby deny a trial to the party against whom the motion for summary judgment is directed." Kulhanek v. Union Pacific RR. Co., 8 Neb. App. 564, 598 N.W.2d 67 (1999)*

BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

1990- 1991.Theft of intellectual property of the Inventor by the government . Issues were heard in Court before the Federal Circuit Ct. of Appeals in case referenced in 2013 1070 and referenced here in which the United States Patent and Trademark Office in conflict with its own interests ignored the prior theft by National Science Foundation of inventor's by taking steps to deliberately slow patent application claiming that it would take **12 years to prosecute** intellectual property which was the priority data filed with patent application in 2004 but later during prosecution was removed.* See Corrected filing receipt dated 2012 and enclosed here with this Appeal as **Exhibit 2** . In secret the National Science Foundation used inventor's intellectual property to transform and introduce new internet around 1993 . Although the Court Case was held in 2013 and a Writ of Mandamus filed in February 2015 – the violations had begun years before. Note . Inventor's address where she lived when corrected filing receipt was mailed to the 2200 Benjamin

Franklin Parkway in Philadelphia as she was forced to rent out her home at 822 So. 5th Street . She alleges that same 'mob' involved today . She still alleges illegal incursions into her computer and documents and being harassed in her everyday life . " I deserve to have my life and dignity back."

2014-2017. United States Patent and Trademark Office held Inventor's Patent Application U.S. #11003123, **the Accessing AccessibilityProcess** in abeyance refusing to even begin prosecution until sometime around 2008 – alleging Jafri apparently entered around 2003 was a statutory bar . Hartman alleges that Jafri was introduced by Patent Office via the NSF to deliberately bar and was not immediately validated. Even so , Jafri could not bar completely as it only covered on type of transaction , a mere sliver of the changes introduced by using the Accessing Accessibility Process . She alleges based on her handicap more than anything else . She is often made the butt of jokes especially cat jokes as when she first appeared on Twitter , her handle was Alpha Kitty . The Federal Circuit Ct. of Appeals in taking up this issue in 2013 did not consider the what the inventor alleges was fraud in the United States Patent and Trademark Office . Further there were other flaws in its opinion as claiming the black inventor's invention was indefinite as it is not . It requires machinery and machinery accessories and is therefore is defined and definite . The Federal Circuit ct. of Appeals did not grant rehearing and did not consider FRAUD in Patent Office . The fact that the inventor's property is used everyday by the government and yet has made no effort to make the inventor whole should make the case still relevant .

2016 . The decisions and opinions entered in by Judges in the 3rd Circuit Ct. of Appeals involved not only fraud which can be proven by evidence and witnesses but that essentially took away the inventor's homes involving two residences and done by a civil conspiracy aided by the production of fraudulent criminal records by someone in the Penna. Judicial Administration leading to not only the takeaway of one home but two that she had purchased and owned . This contributed to the defamation of her character and financial losses of her homes approximately $600,000 . The Internet and Worldwide Web is worth trillions of dollars but only those not like her were gifted with her property by the National Science Foundation and given the opportunity to make names and fortunes for themselves . Plaintiff alleges that these attacks on her have been brutal in not only stripping her of property rights , maligning her character and reputation , but financial and monetary losses and extreme and intentional infliction of distress by numerous individuals involved in the theft and fraud for their own advancement and enrichment . The invasion of privacy , medical malfeasance , extreme distress , harassment and loss of her health are priceless and may never be overcome .

2016 – Again using property taken from the black inventor , Dorothy M. Hartman alleges that the federal government using her intellectual property [her version of the Internet as introduced in secret by the National Science Foundation through Merit Networks of Michigan] was introduced to the public as a public utility – again totally disrespecting the rights of the inventor . The Department of Commerce under the auspices of the presidential administration forming a questionable alliance with a so called private company , ICANN declared the Internet a public utility without any declaration of Eminent Domain . Intellectual property patented or not is assigned to its inventor and like any other property if seized by the Federal Government should be assigned a value that is offered to the owner .

*Inventor suggests that in fairness to all concerned that a patent should be granted as it was interfered with by the National Science Foundation taking her property without her permission and stopping the Prima Facie awarding of a patent from an idea that was novel at the time and the Inventor was the First to Invent and First to File . A licensed patent with both domestic and foreign license and purchased from the Inventor as it should have been would , in applying the 5th and 14th amendment would be advantageous everyone concerned including the Nation .

Sincerely Submitted ,

Signature : "/S/" Dorothy M. Hartman , December 16 , 2020

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

Dorothy M. Hartman

Plaintiff(s),

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:20-cv-00832 EMR

Judge Eleni M. Roumel

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 16, 2020, a copy of Dorothy M. Hartman vs. The United States request that this case be reopened ., was mailed via Email, to Geoffrey M. Long at Dept. of Justice, at 950 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Washington, DC 20530.

Signature : "/S/" Dorothy M. Hartman

(Signature of Applicant)

Dorothy M. Hartman

(Printed Name)

254 So. 16th Street

(Street Address)

Philadelphia , Pa. 19102

(City, State, ZIP Code)

610-924-4014

(Phone Number)