

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

HERBIE D. VEST,
Claimant-Appellant

v.

**DENIS MCDONOUGH, SECRETARY OF
VETERANS AFFAIRS,**
Respondent-Appellee

2022-1869

Appeal from the United States Court of Appeals for
Veterans Claims in No. 21-792, Judge Coral Wong Pietsch.

Decided: March 8, 2024

AMANDA SUNDAY, GloverLuck, LLP, Dallas, TX, argued
for claimant-appellant. Also represented by ADAM R. LUCK.

DANIEL FALKNOR, Commercial Litigation Branch, Civil
Division, United States Department of Justice, Washing-
ton, DC, argued for respondent-appellee. Also represented
by BRIAN M. BOYNTON, ERIC P. BRUSKIN, PATRICIA M.
MCCARTHY; CHRISTINA LYNN GREGG, Y. KEN LEE, Office of
General Counsel, United States Department of Veterans
Affairs, Washington, DC.

Before DYK, CLEVINGER, and CHEN, *Circuit Judges*.

CLEVINGER, *Circuit Judge*

Herbie D. Vest (“Vest”) appeals from the final decision of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims (“Veterans Court”) which dismissed Vest’s appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

I. BACKGROUND

Vest served on active duty in the United States Army from October 6, 1966, to May 24, 1971. J.A. 11. In May 1971, Vest filed a claim for service connection for hearing loss and “ringing in the ears.” J.A. 12. In a September 15, 1971, rating decision, the Veterans Administration Regional Office (“RO”) granted service connection for bilateral hearing loss and tinnitus, each rated at 0%. J.A. 14–15. Subsequently, in a December 17, 1971, decision, the RO denied a request for an increased rating for bilateral hearing loss. J.A. 16.

Vest sent a letter which was received by the RO on March 10, 1972, (“March 1972 Letter”) which said that “[i]n your letter, dated December 17, 1971 you stated that my bilateral hearing loss continues to 0% I believe that there may be an error.” J.A. 17. His letter also said that he had “constant ringing in [his] ears.” J.A. 17.

On January 28, 2016, Vest filed a separate claim for compensation for Meniere’s disease and “ears-ringing.” J.A. 23, 25. In a July 14, 2016, rating decision, the RO granted service connection for Vest’s “[M]eniere[']s disease with bilateral hearing loss, tinnitus, and vertigo (claimed as ears ringing and dizziness),” with a 60% disability rating effective December 10, 2015. J.A. 36–37, 109. Vest disputed this rating, and on November 23, 2018, the RO continued the rating at 60% for Meniere’s disease. J.A. 53–54.

On April 8, 2019, Vest sent a letter to the Department of Veterans Affairs (“VA”) which argued that his March 1972 Letter was “disagreeing with the December 17, 1971 Decision and expressing his belief that it contained an error.” J.A. 61. Therefore, Vest argued that the March 1972 Letter “to the VA was a NOD under the applicable regulations at the time, as it was a written communication expressing dissatisfaction and disagreement with the VA’s noncompensable evaluation for his tinnitus.” J.A. 61. Vest further argued that “[b]ecause [the] VA did not address Mr. Vest’s NOD, it remains pending.” J.A. 61. On February 4, 2020, the RO responded that Vest’s letter “was not accepted as a Notice of Disagreement since you did not state that you were disagreeing with our decision.” J.A. 63.

In response, on June 4, 2020, Vest filed an NOD with a VA Form 10182 (“2020 NOD”) limited to “[w]hether the Veteran’s March 10, 1972 letter constituted a NOD and whether the NOD remains pending.” J.A. 65.

On appeal, the Board of Veterans’ Appeals (“Board”) found that the March 1972 Letter “expressed dissatisfaction only with a December 1971 administrative decision, which denied an increased rating for a hearing loss disability but did not adjudicate entitlement to an increased rating for tinnitus.” J.A. 66. The Board further explained that “although the Veteran discussed tinnitus in his letter and it was received within one year of the September 1971 rating decision, there was no expressed disagreement or dissatisfaction of a decision by the [RO] regarding tinnitus, and the NOD is limited to entitlement to an increased rating for a hearing loss disability.” J.A. 69.

Vest’s appeal of the Board’s October 13, 2020, decision did not challenge the Board’s decision that he never had filed an NOD with his May 1971 tinnitus claim. Instead, Vest limited his appeal to whether his tinnitus claim was still pending because he did not receive a notice of appeal

rights with respect to the September 1971 rating decision. J.A. 79–81, 101–105.

The Veterans Court dismissed the appeal, holding that it did not have “jurisdiction to address th[e] question of defective notice.” *Vest v. McDonough*, No. 21-0792, 2022 WL 538201, at *4 (Vet. App. Feb. 23, 2022). The Veterans Court noted that Vest did not argue that “he had submitted an NOD with the September 1971 rating decision concerning tinnitus, and he does not challenge the Board’s determinations that the March 1972 NOD related only to the December 1971 decision denying an increased rating for hearing loss and that the March 1972 filing was not an NOD with the September 1971 rating decision concerning tinnitus.” *Id.* Therefore, the Veterans Court held that Vest “abandoned the issue [of] whether the March 1972 filing was an NOD with a VA initial decision concerning tinnitus.” *Id.*

The Veterans Court entered judgment on March 17, 2022. Vest timely appealed the Veterans Court’s decision to this court, and we have jurisdiction under 38 U.S.C. § 7292(a).

II. DISCUSSION

This court has jurisdiction to review “the decision [of the Veterans Court] with respect to the validity of a decision of the [Veterans] Court on a rule of law or of any statute or regulation . . . or any interpretation thereof (other than a determination as to a factual matter) that was relied on by the [Veterans] Court in making the decision.” 38 U.S.C. § 7292(a). Whether the Veterans Court has jurisdiction is a matter of statutory interpretation that this court reviews *de novo*. *Andre v. Principi*, 301 F.3d 1354, 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (“We review legal issues, including whether the Veterans Court properly declined to assert jurisdiction . . . without deference.”).

With respect to RO decisions subject to review by the Board, “[a]ppellate review shall be initiated by the filing of a[n NOD].” 38 U.S.C. § 7105(a); *Ledford v. West*, 136 F.3d 776, 779 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (“An NOD is required to initiate the appellate review process . . .”). “[NODs] shall be in writing, [and] shall identify the specific determination with which the claimant disagrees . . .” 38 U.S.C. § 7105(b)(2)(A).

An NOD is the instrument that declares a veteran’s intention to seek appellate review of a decision and initiates the Board’s jurisdiction over a veteran’s claim. *See Hamilton v. Brown*, 39 F.3d 1574, 1575 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (“The [VA] . . . long utilized a document called the [NOD] as the vehicle by which a veteran, aggrieved by the initial determination of a [VA] office, would announce the intention to administratively appeal that initial determination.”); *Cox v. West*, 149 F.3d 1360, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (“[T]here [was] no jurisdiction-conferring NOD . . . that would have supplied the Board with jurisdiction over [the] claim”); *Buckley v. West*, 12 Vet. App. 76, 82 (1998) (“Just as the [Veterans] Court’s jurisdiction is dependent on a jurisdiction-conferring NOD, the Board’s jurisdiction, too, derives from a claimant’s NOD.”).

The Veterans Court has jurisdiction to review decisions of the Board. 38 U.S.C. § 7252(a). A Board decision results from appellate review by the Board of agency action after the filing of a valid NOD. When, as in this case, it is established that a valid NOD has not been filed with respect to a veteran’s claim, and as a result the Board has not issued a decision concerning the claim, the Veterans Court lacks jurisdiction over the claim.

Ledford clearly governs this appeal. In that case, the veteran initially was awarded a 100% disability rating based on individual unemployability. *Ledford*, 136 F.3d at 777. Subsequently, that rating was terminated and changed to a schedular rating that was for a time reduced

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.