

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS **August 25, 2015**

TENTH CIRCUIT

Elisabeth A. Shumaker
Clerk of Court

HANNAH SHELBY STAUFFER;
JOHN STAUFFER,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

COLORADO MEDICAL BILLING
CORPORATION; STAUFFER
SCHOOLS, INC.; KIDS CAMPS,
INC., (nonprofit corp.),

Plaintiffs,

v.

JOLENE C. BLAIR; DANIEL KAUP;
KAREN E. HAYES, D.O.; A
WOMAN'S PLACE OF FORT
COLLINS, P.L.L.P.; PETER
DUSBABEK; TODD VRIESMAN;
MONTGOMERY, KOLODNY,
AMATUZIO & DUSBABEK, L.L.P.;
J. BRADFORD MARCH, III;
MARCH, OLIVE, & PHARRIS,
L.L.P.; CHERYL TRINE; CHERYL
TRINE LAW FIRM, LLC;
CHRISTINE SKORBERG; A
WOMAN'S HEALING CENTER,
LLC,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 15-1193
(D.C. No. 1:13-CV-03256-RM-MJW)
(D. Colo.)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **GORSUCH, O'BRIEN**, and **BACHARACH**, Circuit Judges.

Unhappy with how the Colorado courts handled a civil lawsuit that ended many years ago, John and Hannah Stauffer filed this federal action in the hope of undoing that state court judgment. But given the enduring rule that we lower federal courts lack subject matter jurisdiction to entertain “federal suits that amount to appeals of state-court judgments,” it’s tough to see what business or authority we have wading into the merits of the Stauffers’ claims. *Bolden v. City of Topeka*, 441 F.3d 1129, 1139 (10th Cir. 2006); see *Rooker v. Fid. Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413 (1923); *D.C. Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462 (1983). And that’s far from the only fatal defect in this appeal. As the district court pointed out, the Stauffers already brought (and lost) a federal lawsuit attacking the same state court judgment they complain about in this case. See Final Judgment, *Stauffer v. Blair*, No. 12-CV-01702-WYD-MJW (D. Colo. Nov. 14,

* After examining the briefs and appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist the determination of this appeal. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G). The case is therefore ordered submitted without oral argument. This order and judgment is not binding precedent except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. It may be cited, however, for its persuasive value consistent with Fed. R. App. P. 32.1 and 10th Cir. R. 32.1.

2012). Indeed, we briefly entertained and ultimately dismissed an appeal in that earlier action a few years ago, and we see no reason to consider today arguments or claims that were or could have been raised then. *See Mars v. McDougal*, 40 F.2d 247, 249 (10th Cir. 1930). Accordingly, and for substantially the same reasons given by the district court, we affirm the dismissal of the Stauffers' complaint. All pending motions are denied.

ENTERED FOR THE COURT

Neil M. Gorsuch
Circuit Judge