

Syllabus

NOTICE: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication in the preliminary print of the United States Reports. Readers are requested to notify the Reporter of Decisions, Supreme Court of the United States, in order that corrections may be made before preliminary print goes to press.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Syllabus

**UNITED STATES, PETITIONER *v.* SENATOR
CODY JARVIS****CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

No. 1-05.—Decided January 1, 2022

The National Federal Torts Act was created by Congress in October of 2021 with the intent to “Organize, Redefine, and Create Federal Civil Torts of the United States” See Pub. L. No. 2-13. Respondent, Mr. Senator Cody Jarvis, utilized the Act to file a civil claim against the United States for defamation after alleged injury due to a Defense Intelligence Agency press release stated that Respondent may have been the source of an unauthorized disclosure of classified information to a news service. The United States filed a motion to dismiss with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia on the legal basis that the Act specifically outlines which torts may be pressed against the United States. The lower court denied this motion. Petitioner appealed the lower court’s ruling to this Court through a petition for a writ of certiorari, which we granted. Upon the submission of briefs from only the Petitioner, this Court voted for a summary disposition in favor of the Petitioner.

Held: The United States District Court for the District of Columbia erred in their denial of the Petitioner’s motion for dismissal. Pp. 1-2.

- (a) The United States District Court for the District of Columbia erred when interpreting the language of the National Federal Torts Act. Pp. 1-2.

Opinion of the Court

NOTICE: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication in the preliminary print of the United States Reports. Readers are requested to notify the Reporter of Decisions, Supreme Court of the United States, in order that corrections may be made before preliminary print goes to press.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 1-05

UNITED STATES, PETITIONER *v.* SENATOR
CODY JARVIS

ON CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

[January 1, 2022]

JUSTICE O’CONNOR delivered the opinion of the Court.

The National Federal Torts Act details all the possible claims a plaintiff could make to trigger a trial in civil court. Congress draws a line between claims that an individual or group of such may push on another individual or group of such. They refer to these as “individual civil torts,” see Pub. L. No. 2-13, section II. To what the Court believes to be a typographical error, there are duplicates in relation to what appears to be Section II of this Act. One relates to individual civil torts; the other relates to civil torts that one may make against the government. Petitioner does admit that “two separately identifiable sections exist.” See Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

The question before this Court is whether “the District Court err in denying the United States’ motion to dismiss [the case] under the National Federal Torts Act,” see Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Certiorari. When interpreting statutory law, we “begin with the

Opinion of the Court

familiar canon of statutory construction that the starting point for interpreting a statute is the language of the statute itself.” *CPSC, et al. v. GTE Sylvania, Inc., et al.*, 447 U.S. 102, 108 (1980). And upon doing so, we find that particular statutes within a law can be complicated to dissect—an act we suspect the lower court being a victim of in this case. To better digest the statutes, we read the statute “in their context and with a view to their place in their overall statutory scheme.” *FDA v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, 529 U.S. 120, 133 (2000). Moreover, “[a]bsent a clearly expressed legislative intention to the contrary, [the] language must ordinarily be regarded as conclusive.” *CPSC, et al.*, 447 U.S., at 108. Given a plain reading of the text, we do find that there are no linguistic complications with the statutes.

To return the question at hand, the Court opines that the District Court did err in the denial of dismissal. The language is quite clear in this Act. As to how the lower court erred or was incapable of coming to this conclusion goes above this Court’s head, collectively. The Act reads, “[t]he Government shall be immune from all offenses other than those listed in this section.” The offenses listed in this section would be “false arrest” and “civil action for systematic rights violation.” See Pub. L. No. 2-13. We pick the rest of the paragraph at “[n]o monetary relief shall be rewarded in cases against the government, where the government is a party or when the government has intervened.” *Ibid.* Therefore, our Court finds that the case should have been dismissed based on the language in the National Federal Torts Act.

It is so ordered.