

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

VANESSA R. BALL,)	
)	CASE NO. 2:14-CV-938-WKW
Plaintiff,)	[LEAD CASE]
)	CASE NO. 2:14-CV-939-WKW
v.)	CASE NO. 2:14-CV-940-WKW
)	CASE NO. 2:14-CV-941-WKW
UNITED STATES OF)	CASE NO. 2:14-CV-942-WKW
AMERICA,)	CASE NO. 2:14-CV-943-WKW
)	[MEMBER CASES]
Defendant.)	

ORDER

On February 26, 2015, the Magistrate Judge filed a Recommendation in this case. (Doc. # 15.) On April 9, 2015, Plaintiff Vanessa R. Ball filed a timely Objection. (Doc. # 18.) The court has conducted an independent and *de novo* review of those portions of the Recommendation to which objection is made. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b).

Ms. Ball's Objection is largely devoted to restating arguments she proffered in her state-court complaints, arguments which the Recommendation directly addressed. Ms. Ball's repeated assertions that her state-court complaints against various former co-workers should not have been removed and that the United States should not have been substituted as the named Defendant remain unsupported by statute, case law, and the record. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2679(d)(1), the United States certified that Defendant employees were acting

within the scope of their “employment at the time of the incident out of which the claim arose.” § 2679(d)(1). Further, Ms. Ball acknowledges that the entirety of events that serve as the basis for her complaints occurred during the course of her employment with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. While Ms. Ball thoroughly reiterates her allegations concerning her individual former co-workers, her Objection fails to cure or otherwise address the complaints’ deficiencies regarding this court’s lack of subject-matter jurisdiction, as cited and elaborated upon by the Magistrate Judge in his Recommendation. For these reasons, Ms. Ball’s Objection (Doc. # 18) is due to be overruled.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED as follows:

1. Vanessa R. Ball’s Objection (Doc. # 18) is OVERRULED.
2. The Recommendation (Doc. # 15) is ADOPTED.
3. The United States’s Motion to Dismiss (Doc. # 2) is GRANTED.
4. Vanessa R. Ball’s complaints against the United States are DISMISSED for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction.

A separate final judgment will be entered.

DONE this 7th day of May, 2015.

/s/ W. Keith Watkins
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE