APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

FEDERAL CIRCUIT PROCEEDINGS (No: 2025-1914)

OPINIONS AND ORDERS

Opinion, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (December 2, 2025) 1a

Judgment, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (December 2, 2025) 8a

Order, U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims (May 30, 2025) 10a

Order, U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims (May 1, 2025) 12a

Memorandum Decision, U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims (April 14, 2025) 15a

REHEARING ORDER

Order Denying Petition for Panel Rehearing, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (December 29, 2025) 22a

VETERANS APPEAL PROCEEDINGS (No: 26-4686)

Judgment, U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims (August 13, 2026) 24a

Order, U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims (August 13, 2026) 26a

Order, U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims (July 8, 2026) 28a

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

Letter Regarding U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit Filing Fee (August 13, 2026) . 30a

OTHER DOCUMENTS

Notice of Unrepresented Person Appearance (June 12, 2025) 32a

Informal Brief of Appellant (June 12, 2025) 34a

OPINION, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT (DECEMBER 2, 2025)

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

WILLIE WILLIAMS,

Claimant-Appellant,

v.

DOUGLAS A. COLLINS,
SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,

Respondent-Appellee.

2025-1914

Appeal from the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims in No. 24-1493, Judge Joseph L. Falvey, Jr.

Decided: December 2, 2025

Before: TARANTO, BRYSON, and CUNNINGHAM, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Appellant Willie Williams seeks review of the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims ("the Veterans Court") that denied

his challenge to a decision granting service connection for a disability only as of May 1998. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

I

Mr. Williams served on active duty in the U.S. Army between June 1963 and October 1970. In November 2013, a regional office of the Department of Veterans Affairs ("VA") granted him service connection for a right ankle strain with degenerative joint disease. The regional office assigned him a 0% rating effective March 25, 2002, and a 10% rating effective May 10, 2004.

In March 2023, the Board of Veterans' Appeals altered his disability rating by granting him a right ankle disability rating of 20%, effective March 25, 2002. The Board at that time remanded the case to the regional office with instructions to prepare a Statement of the Case regarding whether Mr. Williams was entitled to an effective date earlier than March 25, 2002, for service connection for his right ankle disability.

On remand, the regional office denied an earlier effective date, and Mr. Williams appealed that decision to the Board. On August 2, 2023, the Board granted him an effective date of May 12, 1998, for his disability claim. App. 9.

Dissatisfied with that decision, Mr. Williams, proceeding pro se, appealed the Board's August 2, 2023, decision to the Veterans Court. In a single-judge decision, the Veterans Court affirmed the Board's decision. The court noted that although Mr. Williams seemed to be raising several issues on appeal, the

only issue before the court in the appeal from the Board's August 2, 2023, decision was whether the Board was correct in finding that there was no "communication from him to VA before May 1998 requesting service connection for a right ankle strain," and therefore Mr. Williams "ha[d] not met his burden of showing any error in the August 2023 Board decision on appeal." App. 4.

Mr. Williams filed a motion seeking reconsideration of the single-judge decision and in the alternative requesting a panel decision. App. 6. The motion for reconsideration by the single judge was denied, and the motion for a panel decision was granted. *Id.* The panel then determined that the single-judge memorandum decision had not "overlooked or misunderstood a fact or point of law prejudicial to the outcome of the appeal." *Id.* The court also ruled that there was not "any conflict with precedential decisions of the Court" and that the appeal did not "otherwise raise[] an issue warranting a precedential decision." *Id.* Concluding that Mr. Williams had not presented any argument warranting consideration by the panel, the court ruled that the single-judge decision would remain the decision of the court. *Id.* at 6–7. Mr. Williams sought review by the en banc Veterans Court, which was denied. App. 8.

Mr. Williams then filed an appeal with this court.

II

The government argues that this court lacks jurisdiction over Mr. Williams's appeal. We agree.

By statute, this court has jurisdiction over appeals from a decision of the Veterans Court "with

respect to the validity of a decision of the Court on a rule of law or of any statute or regulation (other than a refusal to review the schedule of ratings for disabilities adopted under section 1155 of [title 38]) or any interpretation thereof (other than a determination as to a factual matter) that was relied on by the Court in making the decision." 38 U.S.C. § 7292(a). The statute adds that this court "shall have exclusive jurisdiction to review and decide any challenge to the validity of any statute or regulation or any interpretation thereof brought under this section, and to interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, to the extent presented and necessary to a decision," 38 U.S.C. § 7292(c); that the court "shall decide all relevant questions of law, including interpreting constitutional and statutory provisions," *id.*, § 7292(d)(1); and that except to the extent that an appeal presents a constitutional issue, the court "may not review (A) a challenge to a factual determination, or (B) a challenge to a law or regulation as applied to the facts of a particular case," *id.*, § 7292(d)(2).

In his opening and reply briefs, Mr. Williams alludes to a number of issues, none of which raise questions that fall within this court's jurisdiction.

A

In his opening brief on appeal, Mr. Williams focuses on the Veterans Court's failure to grant en banc review of his claim, which he claims violated Rule 35(c) of the Rules of the Veterans Court. That rule provides as follows:

> (c) Motion for Full Court Review. Motions for full Court review are not favored. Ordinarily they will not be granted unless such action

> is necessary to secure or maintain uniformity of the Court's decisions or to resolve a question of exceptional importance. Subject to the requirements of subsections (d), (e), and (f), a party may move for a decision by the full Court—
>
> (1) after a panel has decided a case, or
>
> (2) after a panel has denied a motion for reconsideration or granted a motion for a decision by a panel but held that the single-judge decision remains the decision of the Court.

Rule 35(c), Rules of the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims.

Mr. Williams's argument regarding the Veterans Court's denial of his request for en banc review presents a pure question of the application of law to fact and is therefore outside this court's jurisdiction. Although Mr. Williams asserts in passing that the failure to grant full court review of his claim constitutes "invidious discrimination" and denial of his "constitutional right to a fair hearing," Appellant's Opening Br. at 2–3, those claims are entirely undeveloped and are constitutional in name only. As such, they do not call on this court to "interpret[] constitutional . . . provisions," 38 U.S.C. § 7292(d)(1), and thus do not fall within the provisions of section 7292 that give this court jurisdiction over claims that require this court to interpret constitutional or statutory provisions, *see Arnesen v. Principi*, 300 F.3d 1353, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (the denial of a request for full Veterans Court review does not itself violate due process).

In *Flores v. Nicholson*, 476 F.3d 1379, 1382 (Fed. Cir. 2007), this court explained that merely characterizing a claim as constitutional in nature does not confer upon this court jurisdiction that we otherwise lack. As the court stated, "[t]he appellant's argument . . . appears to be aimed at the merits of her claim and does not raise a separate constitutional issue. Therefore, this court has no jurisdiction to consider this issue." *Id.*; *see also Helfer v. West*, 174 F.3d 1332, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (claim that is constitutional in name only does not confer jurisdiction on this court; the appellant's "characterization of [a] question as constitutional in nature does not confer upon us jurisdiction that we otherwise lack").

B

In his reply brief, Mr. Williams makes broader claims than in his opening brief. In addition to continuing to contend that the court erred by failing to grant en banc review, Appellant's Reply Br. at 4–6, Mr. Williams appears to be challenging the Board's August 2, 2023, decision for failing to address other aspects of his overall challenge to the agency's failure to grant greater relief to him on his overall claim relating to his ankle disability, claims that were only hinted at in his opening brief. *See* Appellant's Opening Br. at 2.

As the Veterans Court explained, however, the only decision before it on appeal was the Board's August 2, 2023, decision that found (in Mr. Williams's favor) that May 12, 1998, was the effective date for his service-connection claim. App. 4. Accordingly, the new issues raised in Mr. Williams's reply brief are not properly before us because they were not raised

in his opening brief. In any event, the new claims raised in his reply brief are not within the scope of his appeal. Those issues were not addressed by the Board (and thus were not addressed by the Veterans Court), because the remand proceeding that was before the Board in the proceeding leading to the Board's August 2, 2023, decision was limited to the effective date of service connection for Mr. Williams's claim.

The Veterans Court's decision did not turn on the validity of that court's interpretation of a rule of law or its interpretation of any statute or regulation. Instead, the court's decision turned at most on a challenge to a law or regulation as applied to the facts of a particular case. For that reason, this appeal does not fall within our jurisdiction to review decisions of the Veterans Court. The appeal therefore must be dismissed.

No costs.

DISMISSED

JUDGMENT, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT (DECEMBER 2, 2025)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

WILLIE WILLIAMS,

Claimant-Appellant,

v.

DOUGLAS A. COLLINS,
SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,

Respondent-Appellee.

2025-1914

Appeal from the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims in No. 24-1493, Judge Joseph L. Falvey, Jr.

JUDGMENT

THIS CAUSE having been considered, it is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED:

DISMISSED

FOR THE COURT

/s/ Jarrett B. Perlow
Clerk of Court
[SEAL]

Date: December 2, 2025

ORDER, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS (MAY 30, 2025)

Designated for electronic publication only

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

WILLIE WILLIAMS,

Appellant,

v.

DOUGLAS A. COLLINS,
SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,

Appellee.

No. 24-1493

Before: ALLEN, Chief Judge, and PIETSCH, BARTLEY, GREENBERG, MEREDITH, TOTH, FALVEY, LAURER, and JAQUITH, Judges.

ORDER

Note: Pursuant to U.S. Vet. App. R. 30(a), this action may not be cited as precedent.

In an April 14, 2025, memorandum decision, the Court affirmed an August 2, 2023, Board of Veterans' Appeals decision that denied an effective date prior to May 12, 1998, for service connection for a right ankle

strain with degenerative joint disease. On April 17, 2025, the appellant timely filed a motion for reconsideration or, in the alternative, for a panel decision. On May 1, 2025, the single judge denied reconsideration, the panel granted the motion for panel decision, and the panel held that the April 14, 2025, single-judge memorandum decision remains the decision of the Court. On May 5, 2025, the appellant timely filed a motion for full Court review.

"Motions for full Court review are not favored. Ordinarily they will not be granted unless such action is necessary to secure or maintain uniformity of the Court's decisions or to resolve a question of exceptional importance." U.S. Vet. App. R. 35(c). In this matter, the appellant has not shown that either basis exists to warrant full Court review.

Upon consideration of the foregoing, it is

ORDERED that the motion for full Court review is denied.

PER CURIAM.

Dated: May 30, 2025

Copies to:

Willie Williams
VA General Counsel (027)

ORDER, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS (MAY 1, 2025)

Not published
NON-PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

WILLIE WILLIAMS,

Appellant,

v.

DOUGLAS A. COLLINS,
SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,

Appellee.

No. 24-1493

Before: ALLEN, Chief Judge, and TOTH and FALVEY, Judges.

ORDER

Note: Pursuant to U.S. Vet. App. R. 30(a), this action may not be cited as precedent.

In an April 14, 2025, memorandum decision, the Court affirmed the self-represented appellant's appeal of the August 2, 2023, Board of Veterans' Appeals decision that denied an effective date prior to May 12,

1998, for service connection for a right ankle strain with degenerative joint disease. On April 17, 2025, the appellant timely filed a motion for reconsideration or, in the alternative, for a panel decision. The motion for reconsideration by the single judge will be denied, and the motion for a panel will be granted.

Based on review of the pleadings and the record of proceedings, it is the decision of the panel that the appellant fails to demonstrate that 1) the single-judge memorandum decision overlooked or misunderstood a fact or point of law prejudicial to the outcome of the appeal, 2) there is any conflict with precedential decisions of the Court, or 3) the appeal otherwise raises an issue warranting a precedential decision. U.S. Vet. App. R. 35(e); *see also Frankel v. Derwinski*, 1 Vet. App. 23, 25-26 (1990). The appellant has not presented any argument that warrants consideration by the panel.

Absent further motion by the parties or order by the Court, judgment will enter on the underlying single-judge decision in accordance with Rules 35 and 36 of the Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Upon consideration of the foregoing, it is

ORDERED, by the single judge, that the motion for reconsideration is denied. It is further

ORDERED, by the panel, that the motion for panel decision is granted. It is further

ORDERED, by the panel, that the single-judge decision remains the decision of the Court.

PER CURIAM.

Dated: May 1, 2025

Copies to:

Willie Williams
VA General Counsel (027)

MEMORANDUM DECISION, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS (APRIL 14, 2025)

Designated for electronic publication only

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

WILLIE WILLIAMS,

Appellant,

v.

DOUGLAS A. COLLINS,
SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,

Appellee.

No. 24-1493

Before: FALVEY, Judge.

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Note: Pursuant to U.S. Vet. App. R. 30(a), this action may not be cited as precedent.

FALVEY, *Judge*:

Army veteran Willie Williams, who is self-represented, appeals an August 2, 2023, Board of Veterans' Appeals decision denying an effective date before May 12, 1998, for service connection for a right ankle strain with degenerative joint disease (DJD). The

appeal is timely, the Court has jurisdiction to review the Board decision, and single-judge disposition is appropriate. *See* 38 U.S.C. §§ 7252(a), 7266(a); *Frankel v. Derwinski*, 1 Vet.App. 23, 25-26 (1990).

Because Mr. Williams's arguments are unpersuasive, challenge decisions and issues not on appeal, and do not contain enough particularity for the Court to understand his contentions, we will affirm the Board decision.

I. Background

The procedural history of Mr. Williams's VA claims is long and includes many regional office (RO) and Board decisions. And so, the Court will focus on the portion that seems relevant to the veteran's assertions as we understand them.

In November 2013, the RO granted service connection for a right ankle strain with DJD with a 0% rating effective March 25, 2002, and a 10% rating effective May 10, 2004. Record (R.) at 4023.

In March 2023, the Board granted an initial 20% right ankle disability rating and remanded a claim for an effective date before March 25, 2002, for service connection for a right ankle disability. R. at 120; *see* R. at 128 (finding that the 20% rating was warranted for the entire appeal period, which seems to have been from March 2002 onward). The Board determined that remand was warranted because the RO had not complied with a May 2022 Board remand directive to issue a Statement of the Case (SOC) concerning the earlier effective date claim. R. at 129. In April 2023, the RO issued an SOC denying an effective date earlier than March 25, 2002, for

service connection for the right ankle disability. R. at 68.

In the August 2023 decision on appeal, the Board granted an effective date of May 12, 1998, but no earlier, for service connection for the ankle disability. R. at 3. The Board noted that, during a May 1998 hearing, Mr. Williams identified a right ankle condition associated with his service-connected right foot hallux valgus (bunion) and requested that the condition be compensated. R. at 5 (noting that reasonable doubt was resolved in the veteran's favor). The Board concluded that an effective date before May 1998 was not warranted, however, because the informal claim for service connection was not received within 1 year of separation from service (October 1970), nor was there an earlier written communication showing a request to apply for benefits related to the right ankle. R. at 5.

II. Analysis

The Court liberally construes Mr. Williams's informal briefs. *See De Perez v. Derwinski*, 2 Vet.App. 85, 86 (1992). Even so, it is difficult for us to understand what he is trying to argue. For example, Mr. Williams asserts that the issue presented is:

> Whether the Board of Veterans Appeals August 2, 2023 Order reasons for decision correctly rejected appellant appeal for higher evaluation rating and earlier effective date of right ankle strain with degenerative joint disease addressed in BVA hearing of May 12, 1998 on the bases of an informal claim receipt which allows for earlier effective date, etc. is not a continually prosecution by

> the Board per (38 CFR 3.155; 38 CFR 3.400) that conclude BVA 20% percent decision represents grant that is considered to be a full and final determination of this issue on appeal; [1] is determined noncompliant with [Board March 27, 2023 remand] that concede: In [May 1998] Board {total disability} hearing reported veteran swelling & weakness right ankle, w/functional impairment, difficulty with prolonged standing, walking, squatting, and bending . . .

Appellant's Brief (Br.) at PDF[1] p. 5.

If Mr. Williams is contending that the August 2023 Board decision did not comply with the March 2023 Board remand, we find this contention unpersuasive. In the March 2023 decision, the Board remanded the claim for an effective date before March 25, 2002, for service connection for a right ankle disability because the RO had not issued an SOC on this claim. R. at 129. In April 2023, the RO then *issued an SOC* denying an effective date earlier than March 25, 2002, for service connection for the right ankle disability. R. at 68. Thus, it is unclear to the Court how VA did not comply with the March 2023 remand instruction.

As much as Mr. Williams is arguing that the August 2023 Board decision should have considered whether an initial right ankle rating above 20% was warranted, as the Secretary explains, Secretary's Br. at 11-12, that claim was not on appeal to the Board.

---

[1] For clarity, we will cite to the portable document format (PDF) page.

It is unclear from the parties' briefs whether Mr. Williams appealed the March 2023 Board decision that granted an initial 20% rating, but no higher, for a right ankle disability, which would have been the proper course for challenging the right ankle rating.

And if Mr. Williams is arguing that the Board should have assigned the initial 20% rating to the period between May 12, 1998, and March 25, 2002, it is also unclear from the parties' briefs or the record if VA has already assigned that rating for this period. What's more, if that is his argument, Mr. Williams has not explained how the assignment of such a rating was not a downstream issue of the matter on appeal in the August 2023 Board decision, which was *service connection* for the right ankle strain before March 2002. *See Grantham v. Brown*, 114 F.3d 1156, 1159 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (noting that downstream elements, such as the disability rating, are issues separate from service connection and holding that a Notice of Disagreement pertaining to service connection cannot initiate appellate review of downstream elements).

The rest of Mr. Williams's brief seems to raise issues with the March 2023 Board decision. *See, e.g.*, Appellant's Br. at PDF p. 12 (asserting that the March 2023 Board decision "withheld . . . relevant supporting [v]eteran evidence" and that its "[f]indings and [c]onclusions resort to false and fraudulent interpretation of the Board['s] May[] 2002 remand"); *id.* at 14 (contending that the March 2023 Board decision was clearly erroneous and that the Court should reverse it). The Secretary points this out and correctly explains that the March 2023 Board decision is not on appeal here. Secretary's Br. at 9-12. Mr.

Williams acknowledges the Secretary's argument in his reply brief, Appellant's Reply Br. at PDF p. 9, but does not clarify how any of his arguments were actually challenges of the August 2023 Board decision on appeal.

Instead, Mr. Williams then asserts that the Secretary

> attempts to direct the Court['s] attention away from transmittal records of proceedings that demonstrated error in RO November, 1970 decision 0% percent severity of [v]eteran['s] "right foot hallux valgus" disability; where later record will directly conclude evidence establish [v]eteran['s] entitlement to retroactive benefits higher than 30% to 100% rating from Nov. 1970 through Nov. 1988; and thereafter.

Appellant's Reply Br. at PDF p. 9. But, similarly, the proper rating for Mr. Williams's right foot bunion disability is not on appeal here.

Mr. Williams bears the burden of demonstrating error in the Board decision on appeal and his arguments about any such error must contain "some particularity." *See Shinseki v. Sanders*, 556 U.S. 396, 409 (2009); *Coker v. Nicholson*, 19 Vet.App. 439, 442 (2006) ("The Court requires that an appellant plead with some particularity the allegation of error so that the Court is able to review and assess the validity of the appellant's arguments."), *rev'd on other grounds sub nom. Coker v. Peake*, 310 F. App'x 371 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

Even with the Court liberally construing Mr. Williams's briefs, *see De Perez*, 2 Vet.App. at 86, he has not provided enough particularity in his assertions

for us to understand what he is trying to argue. And because he has not explained how, or pointed to evidence showing that, there was any communication from him to VA before May 1998 requesting service connection for a right ankle strain, he has not met his burden of showing any error in the August 2023 Board decision on appeal. Thus, the Court will affirm that decision.

III. Conclusion

On consideration of the above, the August 2, 2023, Board decision denying an effective date before May 12, 1998, for service connection for a right ankle strain with DJD is AFFIRMED.

Dated: April 14, 2025

Copies to:

Willie Williams
VA General Counsel (027)

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR PANEL REHEARING, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT (DECEMBER 29, 2025)

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

WILLIE WILLIAMS,

Claimant-Appellant,

v.

DOUGLAS A. COLLINS,
SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,

Respondent-Appellee.

No. 2025-1914

Appeal from the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims in No. 24-1493, Judge Joseph L. Falvey, Jr.

Before: TARANTO, BRYSON, and CUNNINGHAM, Circuit Judges.

ON PETITION FOR PANEL REHEARING

PER CURIAM.

ORDER

On December 9, 2025, Willie Williams filed a petition for panel rehearing [ECF No. 15].

Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

The petition for panel rehearing is denied.

FOR THE COURT

/s/ Jarrett B. Perlow
Clerk of Court
[SEAL]

Date: December 29, 2025

JUDGMENT, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS (AUGUST 13, 2026)

Not published

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

WILLIE WILLIAMS,

Petitioner,

v.

DOUGLAS A. COLLINS,
SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,

Respondent.

No. 26-4686

JUDGMENT

The Court has issued a decision in this case, and has acted on a motion under Rule 35 of the Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Under Rule 36, judgment is entered and effective this date.

FOR THE COURT:

Tiffany M. Wagner
Clerk of the Court

By: /s/ Brooke Bragunier
Deputy Clerk

Dated: August 13, 2026

Copies to:

Willie Williams
VA General Counsel (027)

ORDER, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS (AUGUST 13, 2026)

Designated for electronic publication only

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

WILLIE WILLIAMS,

Petitioner,

v.

DOUGLAS A. COLLINS,
SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,

Respondent.

No. 26-4686

Before: ALLEN, Chief Judge, and PIETSCH, MEREDITH, TOTH, FALVEY, LAURER, and JAQUITH, Judges.

ORDER

Note: Pursuant to U.S. Vet. App. R. 30(a), this action may not be cited as precedent.

In a June 18, 2026, single-judge order, the Court denied the self-represented petitioner's June 4, 2026, petition for extraordinary relief in the nature of a writ of mandamus. On June 19, 2026, the petitioner

timely filed a motion for reconsideration or, in the alternative, a panel decision. On July 8, 2026, the Court denied the motion for reconsideration, granted the petitioner's motion for a panel decision, and ordered that the single-judge order remains the decision of the Court. On July 10, 2026, the petitioner filed a timely motion for full Court review.

"Motions for full Court review are not favored. Ordinarily they will not be granted unless such action is necessary to secure or maintain uniformity of the Court's decisions or to resolve a question of exceptional importance." U.S. VET. APP. R. 35(c). In this matter, the petitioner has not shown that either basis exists to warrant full Court review.

Upon consideration of the foregoing, it is

ORDERED that the motion for full Court review is denied.

PER CURIAM.

Dated: August 13, 2026

Copies to:

Willie Williams
VA General Counsel (027)

ORDER, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS (JULY 8, 2026)

Not published
NON-PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

WILLIE WILLIAMS,

Petitioner,

v.

DOUGLAS A. COLLINS,
SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,

Respondent.

No. 26-4686

Before: ALLEN, Chief Judge, and FALVEY and LAURER, Judges.

ORDER

Note: Pursuant to U.S. Vet. App. R. 30(a), this action may not be cited as precedent.

In a June 18, 2026, single-judge order, the Court denied the self-represented petitioner's June 4, 2026, petition for extraordinary relief in the nature of a writ of mandamus . On June 19, 2026, the petitioner

timely filed a motion for panel review. The motion for decision by a panel will be granted.

Based on review of the pleadings, it is the decision of the panel that the petitioner fails to demonstrate that 1) the single-judge order overlooked or misunderstood a fact or point of law prejudicial to the outcome of the petition, 2) there is any conflict with precedential decisions of the Court, or 3) the petition otherwise raises an issue warranting a precedential decision. U.S. VET. APP. R. 35(e); *see also Frankel v. Derwinski*, 1 Vet.App. 23, 25-26 (1990). The petitioner has not presented any argument that warrants consideration by the panel.

Absent further motion by the parties or order by the Court, judgment will enter on the underlying single-judge order in accordance with Rules 35 and 36 of the Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Upon consideration of the foregoing, it is

ORDERED, by the panel, that the motion for panel decision is granted. It is further

ORDERED, by the panel, that the single-judge order remains the decision of the Court.

PER CURIAM.

Dated: July 8, 2026

Copies to:
Willie Williams
VA General Counsel (027)

LETTER REGARDING U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT FILING FEE (AUGUST 13, 2026)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR VETERANS CLAIMS
625 Indiana Avenue, NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20004-2950

August 13, 2026

Willie Williams
P.O. Box 1415
Greenville, TX 75403-1415

Re: *Willie Williams v. Douglas A. Collins* 26-4686

Dear Mr. Williams:

On August 13, 2026, the Court received your Notice of Appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

The "Rules of Practice before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit" require a filing fee of $600. You may pay the $600 filing fee through pay.gov (www.uscourts.cavc.gov/fee_filingfee.php) In the alternative you may pay by check or money order payable to the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims OR file a motion to proceed without costs.

For your convenience, I have enclosed a motion to proceed without costs. Please return the filing fee or motion to proceed without costs within 14 days.

Sincerely,

Tiffany M. Wagner
Clerk of the Court

By: /s/ Brooke Bragunier
Deputy Clerk

Enclosure:

Motion to proceed without costs

NOTICE OF UNREPRESENTED PERSON APPEARANCE (JUNE 12, 2025)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

Case Number: CAVC 24-1493

Short Case Caption: William v. Collins

Instructions: Refer to Federal Circuit Rule 47.3 for requirements governing appearance in this court. Unrepresented persons must immediately file an amended Form 8B if contact information changes. A motion must be filed to change either the filing or service selection during the pendency of the case.

Complete page 1 of this form and, if applicable, either page 2 or 3 corresponding to your filing and service selection. Submit only one of pages 2 or 3; do not submit both.

ENTRY OF APPEARANCE

I am entering my appearance on my own behalf ("pro se") in the above case.

Name: Willie Williams
Address: P.O. Box 1415
Greenville, Texas 75403-1415
Phone: (903) 455-8404
Email: Merry_1998@att.net

FILING AND SERVICE SELECTION

I will file all documents in the above case (select only one):

☒ In paper form by mail or in person, and I elect to receive all service by mail only.

[. . .]

I certify that all information is true and correct and that a failure to abide by the above selections may result in my case being delayed or other actions deemed necessary by the court.

Date: June 12, 2025

Signature: /s/ Willie Williams

Name: Willie Williams

INFORMAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT
(JUNE 12, 2025)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

Case Number: CAVC 24-1493

Short Case Caption: William v. Collins

Name of Appellant: Willie Williams

Instructions: Read the Guide for Unrepresented Parties before completing this form. Answer the questions as best as you can. Attach additional pages as needed to answer the questions. This form and continuation pages may not exceed 30 pages.

Attach a copy of the opinion, order, and/or judgment of the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims. You may also attach other record material as an appendix. Any attached material should be referenced in answer to the below questions. Please redact (erase, cover, or otherwise make unreadable) social security numbers or comparable private personal identifiers that appear in any attachments you submit.

1. Have you ever had another case in this court?

☑ No

If yes, state the name and number of each case.

N/A

2. Did the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims decision involve the validity or interpretation of a statute or regulation?

☑ Yes

If yes, what are your arguments concerning those issues?

Joint Judge(s) March 30, 2025 affirmation of single judge April 14, 2025 memorandum decision involve error in interpretation and applicability of Rule 35(c) attest that appellant Full Court request has not shown either action necessary to secure or maintain uniformity in Court decisions or resolve a question of exceptional importance contrary with *Frankel v. Derwinski; and Bethea v. Principi*, 2 Vet. App. 252 (1992) (decision that materially conflict with earlier court decisions); or a (Veteran constitutional rights) linked to Complainant-Appellant history of non-compliant denial of "earlier effective date" issue part of {non-resolved} consecutive Board & CAVC remands dating from 2009 thru 2023.

3. Did the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims decide constitutional issues?

☑ Yes

If yes, what are your arguments concerning those issues?

Joint Judge(s) March 30, 2025 affirmation of single judge April 14, 2025 memorandum decision denied [Williams] "earlier effective date prior to May 12, 1998" constitutional guarantee of "equal protection" under Title 38 Section 5110(a); *See* 38 CFR section 3.400 (date of receipt of claim of date entitlement arose;

unless claim received within one year after separation from service); where CAVC pursuant to Rule 35(c) denied full court review: "not granted unless such action is necessary to secure or maintain uniformity of the Court's decision or to resolve a question of exceptional importance," ignored [Williams] right to be free from invidious discrimination in statutory classifications and other governmental activity. *See; Harris v. McRae*, 448 U.S. 297, 322 (1980)

4. Did the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims fail to decide any other issue correctly?

   ☑ Yes

   If yes, how?

{Williams} had a constitutional right to a fair hearing on the merits of his 2009 through 2023 Board of Veterans Appeals and the Court of Veterans Appeals disability claim remanded accordingly for the fundamentally fair procedures and that the initial and subsequent determinations has been subject to nothing but deferential review that continues with the same concealed evidence during adjudication, misstatements of material facts, misstatements of law, fraudulent submissions and omissions.

5. Are there other arguments you wish to make?

   ☒ Yes

   If yes, what are the arguments?

Veterans Court Judge(s) Allen, Pietsch, Bartley, Greenberg, Meredith, Toth, Falvey, Laurer, Jaquith engaged in conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the court disparately unable to discharge their May 30,

2025 Order & Judgement duties discriminatively denying [minority] Appellant [Willie Williams] reconsideration, then [in part] panel granted a panel decision that ultimately held that the April 14, 2025 single judge memorandum decision remained the decision of the Court; then denied Rule 35(c) matter concluding that the appellant has not shown either of the following basis exists to warrant full court review.

6. What action do you want this court to take in this case?

Grant immediate retroactive benefits due, Vacate and Reverse Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims May 30, 2025, and April 14, 2025 joint Veteran Court Judge(s) constitutional rights violation; denied "equal protection" under Title 38 Section 5110(a); *See* 38 CFR section 3.400 (date of receipt of claim or date entitlement arose; unless claim received within one year after separation from service); denied fair hearing on the merits of [Williams] 2009 through 2023 Board of Veterans Appeals and the Court of Veterans Appeals disability claim remanded accordingly; unresolved and denied to this day entitlement to earlier that May 12, 1998 service connected right ankle strain; Article III of the Constitution case and controversy.

Date: June 12, 2025

Signature: /s/ Willie Williams

Name: Willie Williams