

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

VESNA BIVOLAREVIC,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
vs.  
  
U.S. CIA,  
  
Defendant.

Case No: C 09-4620 SBA  
  
**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION TO DISCLOSE FISA  
SURVEILLANCE**  
  
Dkt. 85


Plaintiff Vesna Bivolarevic filed the instant pro se action against the CIA (i.e., the Central Intelligence Agency), alleging that she has been subjected to “voice to skull technology (in different forms) since . . . January 2005.” Compl. at 1. On March 8, 2010, the Court granted Defendant’s motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1). Plaintiff appealed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, which dismissed the appeal as untimely on December 9, 2010.

This matter is now before the Court on Plaintiff’s Motion to Disclose FISA Surveillance, filed August 7, 2017. Dkt. 85. As the Court previously found, Plaintiff failed to demonstrate the existence of subject matter jurisdiction. Having failed to timely appeal that ruling, the Court’s prior dismissal is final. Because subject matter jurisdiction is lacking, no further substantive action is appropriate in this case. Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env’t, 523 U.S. 83, 94-95 (1998) (a federal court cannot reach the merits of any dispute unless it has subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate the issues presented). Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT Plaintiff’s Motion to Disclose FISA Surveillance is DENIED. Plaintiff shall not submit any further filings in this closed case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 9/6/17

  
SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG  
Senior United States District Judge