

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

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

In Re MARK INGRAHAM,
Petitioner

2026-138

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States Court of Federal Claims in No. 1:26-cv-00475-TMD, Judge Thompson M. Dietz.

ON PETITION

PER CURIAM.

ORDER

Mark Ingraham files a document entitled “Petition for Writ of Mandamus to Compel Clerk to Issue Summons,” ECF No. 2 at 1, stating the United States Court of Federal Claims “Clerk states defendant was already served . . . Clerk should either confirm this or issue summons,” *id.* at 2.

A petitioner seeking the extraordinary remedy of mandamus must show: (1) “no other adequate means to attain the relief he desires,” (2) a “clear and indisputable” right to relief, and (3) the writ is “appropriate under the circumstances.” *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for D.C.*, 542 U.S. 367,

380–81 (2004) (cleaned up). Mr. Ingraham fails to meet this demanding standard. He has not shown clear entitlement to relief given that the Court of Federal Claims’s docket indicates service on the Department of Justice and the date on which the answer is due. *See* Docket Text for Dkt. No. 1 (“Copy Served Electronically on Department of Justice” and “Answer due by 5/28/2026”); *see also* RCFC 4 (describing the manner, proof, and date of service on the United States).¹ Nor has Mr. Ingraham demonstrated the inadequacy of an appeal following final judgment.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

The petition is denied, and any pending motions are denied.

FOR THE COURT



Jarrett B. Perlow
Clerk of Court

May 22, 2026
Date

¹ Note that Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4, regarding summons, applies to United States district courts. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.