## In the United States Court of Federal Claims

No. 13-465C (Filed: June 19, 2017)

## **NOTICE**

The court hereby takes judicial notice of the recent decision issued by the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit ("Sixth Circuit") in <u>Brott v. United States</u>, No. 16-1466, 2017 WL 2346989 (6th Cir. May 31, 2017). The appeal in <u>Brott</u> concerned the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan's dismissal of a complaint by various landowners requesting that the court declare as unconstitutional the limitations of the Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1491 (2012), which vests the United States Court of Federal Claims with exclusive jurisdiction over Fifth Amendment takings claims in excess of \$10,000. <u>Id.</u> at \*1, 9. The landowners also demanded a jury trial for their Just Compensation claims. <u>Id.</u> at \*1. In affirming the various rulings of the district court, which found no constitutional infirmity in the Tucker Act, the Sixth Circuit held, inter alia:

Congress has acted constitutionally in bestowing on the Court of Federal Claims, an Article I court, exclusive jurisdiction over the landowners' compensation claims and removing the right to a jury trial for claims brought in the Court of Federal Claims and in the district court under the Little Tucker Act.

<u>Id.</u> The Sixth Circuit further rejected arguments by the landowners that the Constitution entitled them to a jury trial before an Article III tribunal. Id. at \*1, 8-9.

s/ Margaret M. Sweeney
MARGARET M. SWEENEY
Judge