

NOT RECOMMENDED FOR PUBLICATION

No. 25-1276

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

FILED
Sep 22, 2025
KELLY L. STEPHENS, Clerk

JAMES EDWARD WHITE,)	
)	
Plaintiff-Appellant,)	
)	
v.)	ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED
)	STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
U.S. SUPREME COURT, named as Supreme Court)	THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
of the United States and employees c/o Chief)	MICHIGAN
Justice Roberts, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants-Appellees.)	

ORDER

Before: MOORE, COLE, and GRIFFIN, Circuit Judges.

Pro se plaintiff James Edward White appeals the district court’s judgment dismissing his federal civil rights complaint under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and denying his motions to amend the complaint. This case has been referred to a panel of the court that, upon examination, unanimously agrees that oral argument is not needed. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a). We affirm the district court’s judgment for the reasons below.

In August 2017, Michigan State University (MSU) laid off White from his job as an information technologist. *See White v. Mich. State Univ.*, No. 349812, 2020 WL 5495268, at *1 (Mich. Ct. App. Sep. 10, 2020) (per curiam). The Michigan Unemployment Insurance Agency (UIA) approved White’s application for unemployment benefits. But based on MSU’s representation that it had allocated White’s earned vacation time towards the first two weeks of his layoff, the UIA disallowed benefits for the week of September 30, 2017.

White’s challenges to this decision, both administratively and through the state courts, failed. White then unsuccessfully petitioned the United States Supreme Court to review his case.

No. 25-1276

- 2 -

President Joseph Biden, Attorney General Merrick Garland, and several members of the House of Representatives also failed or refused to help White.

White next turned to federal district court. White filed a complaint against “the Supreme Court of the United States and [its] employees,” the “United States House of Representatives members and staff,” and “the Executive Branch of the United States and [its] employees.” In general, White claimed that these governmental branches violated their constitutional duty to enforce the separation of powers by not correcting the state courts’ alleged violations of his constitutional rights. White demanded “justice,” costs, compensatory and punitive damages, and an order compelling the federal and state governments to investigate the UIA and correct all errors made in the last 15 years.

A magistrate judge recommended granting the government’s motion to dismiss on the ground that the defendants were entitled to sovereign immunity, which deprived the court of subject-matter jurisdiction. The district court, over White’s objections, adopted the recommendation and dismissed the complaint.

We review *de novo* the district court’s dismissal of a complaint for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1). *Cartwright v. Garner*, 751 F.3d 752, 760 (6th Cir. 2014). A complaint is subject to dismissal under Rule 12(b)(1) if the factual allegations, accepted as true and viewed in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, show that the court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction. *Carrier Corp. v. Outokumpu Oyj*, 673 F.3d 430, 440 (6th Cir. 2012).

Jurisdiction over a suit against the United States and its agencies requires Congress to waive the government’s sovereign immunity. *See FDIC v. Meyer*, 510 U.S. 471, 475 (1994); *Mynatt v. United States*, 45 F.4th 889, 894 (6th Cir. 2022). “Under long-settled law, Congress must use unmistakable language to abrogate sovereign immunity.” *Fin. Oversight & Mgmt. Bd. for P.R. v. Centro de Periodismo Investigativo, Inc.*, 598 U.S. 339, 342 (2023). And here, White did not satisfy his burden of identifying a statutory text in which Congress unmistakably waived the government’s sovereign immunity as to his claims in the original complaint, and White’s

No. 25-1276

- 3 -

proposed amended complaints likewise did not remedy this deficiency. *See Lane v. Pena*, 518 U.S. 187, 192 (1996); *Gaetano v. United States*, 994 F.3d 501, 506 (6th Cir. 2021). Consequently, the district court correctly concluded that it lacked subject-matter jurisdiction over White's complaint.

Accordingly, we **AFFIRM** the district court's judgment.

ENTERED BY ORDER OF THE COURT



Kelly L. Stephens, Clerk

United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

U.S. Mail Notice of Docket Activity

The following transaction was filed on 09/22/2025.

Case Name: James White v. U.S. Supreme Court, et al

Case Number: 25-1276

Docket Text:

ORDER filed : AFFIRMED Mandate to issue., pursuant to FRAP 34(a)(2)(C), decision not for publication. Karen Nelson Moore, Circuit Judge; R. Guy Cole, Jr., Circuit Judge and Richard Allen Griffin, Circuit Judge.

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document Description: Order

Notice will be sent to:

Mr. James Edward White
4107 Breakwater Drive
Okemos, MI 48864

A copy of this notice will be issued to:

Ms. Laura Ann Babinsky
Ms. Ann E. Filkins