

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

In re: ANDREW G. BODNAR, CHRISTINE M. ZAJ-
BODNAR, FRANK H. BUNKER, RICHARD R.
CARTER, M. LYNN CARTER, J. THOMAS CONKLIN
TRUST, GERARD V. COSGROVE, RUTH
COSGROVE, as trustees of the Gerard V. Cosgrove
and Ruth Cosgrove Living Trust, MARILYN J.
CUNAT, MARC DEL MARIANI, MARY DEL
MARIANI, EHRET MICHIGAN TRUST, GEORGE J.
GREGULE, JR., VICTORIA JACKSON, aka Victoria
Illsen, HYUN S. JYUNG TRUST, ROBERT J. KANE,
PATRICIA KANE, FRANK F. LAHR, CHARLOTTE
D. LAHR, RICHARD NEUSER, ROBERT S.
PANCOAST, PAMELA S. PANCOAST, LEONARD J.
SMITH, KAY F. VARGA, aka Kay F. Smith, ROBERT
D. MELCHER, MARIA MELCHER, CRAIG D.
OKONSKI, CHERIE R. OKONSKI, KENT WERGER,
MARGARET WERGER, ROGER B. WILSCHKE, ANN
C. WILSCHKE, COUNTRY, L.L.C., L. RICHARD
MARZKE, NANCY A. MARZKE, NOTRE DAME
PATH CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION, HERZL
RAGINE, M.D., ELIZABETH S. ERRANT, aka Eliza-
beth Saphir, BANK ONE, FKA NBD BANK, N.A.,
Petitioners

2020-125

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States
Court of Federal Claims in Nos. 1:00-cv-00379-EMR, 1:00-

cv-00381-EMR, 1:00-cv-00382-EMR, 1:00-cv-00384-EMR, 1:00-cv-00385-EMR, 1:00-cv-00386-EMR, 1:00-cv-00387-EMR, 1:00-cv-00391-PEC, 1:00-cv-00392-EMR, 1:00-cv-00393-EMR, 1:00-cv-00394-EMR, 1:00-cv-00395-EMR, 1:00-cv-00396-EMR, 1:00-cv-00398-EMR, 1:00-cv-00399-EMR, 1:00-cv-00400-EMR, 1:00-cv-00401-EMR, 1:05-cv-01381-EMR, 1:06-cv-00072-EMR, 1:99-cv-04452-EMR, 1:99-cv-04453-EMR, 1:99-cv-04455-EMR, 1:99-cv-04457-EMR, 1:99-cv-04458-EMR, 1:99-cv-44510-EMR, and 1:99-cv-4456-EMR, Judge Eleni M. Roumel.

ON PETITION

Before REYNA, WALLACH, and STOLL, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

ORDER

Petitioners seek a writ of mandamus asking this court to direct the United States to indicate whether it agrees or disagrees with their calculations regarding real estate lost by erosion “and to provide its own calculations if it disagrees without further delay.” We find that the petitioners have not demonstrated that they satisfy the standard for mandamus relief at this time.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

The petition for writ of mandamus is denied.

FOR THE COURT

May 20, 2020
Date

/s/ Peter R. Marksteiner
Peter R. Marksteiner
Clerk of Court