5 13 13 12 th 1-1081

QAD

1

ŧ

United States General Accounting Office Washington, DC 20548

11049

Office of General Counsel

In Reply B-199047 Refer to:

June 19, 1980

d 🖬 👔 🖓

The Honorable Alice Daniel Assistant Attorney General for give than the take to public to a public to

Dear Ms, Daniel:

Subject: James A. Bailey v. U.S., No. 230-80C Matthew H. Bird v. U.S., No. 231-80C Gerald Bryan v. U.S., No. 232-80C Joseph J. Folz, Jr. v. U.S., No. 233-80C Kenneth W. Love v. U.S., No. 234-80C Gerald L. Minkow v. U.S., No. 235-80C John R. Patton v. U.S., No. 235-80C Stephen D. Schiff v. U.S., No. 237-80C Bradley L. Shelton v. U.S., No. 238-80C Walter P. Thompson v. U.S., No. 239-80C Ralph I. Wareham, II v. U.S., No. 240-80C (Your reference: LRDavis:aft 154-230-80C thru 154-240-80C)

Commercial Litigation Branch

This letter is in response to yours dated May 29, 1980, requesting a litigation report on the nearly identical petitions filed in the Court of Claims in the above-entitled cases on May 15, 1980, in which the plaintiffs allege that they were improperly separated from extended active duty as Reserve officers of the United States Air Force. The Court of Claims' opinions in <u>Doyle v. United States</u>, 599 F. 2d 984 (Ct. Cl. 1979), and <u>Stewart v. United States</u>, 611 F. 2d 1356 (Ct. Cl. 1979), appear to be pertinent to the issues presented in these petitions.

There is no record of any claim having been filed by any of the plaintiffs in the General Accounting Office on account of the matters set forth in the petitions, and we have no information about the facts of these cases other than the allegations contained in the

١



B-199047

S. Sandala

Petitions. Also, no record has been found in our Office of any active claim or demand which might furnish the basis for a cross action against any of the plaintiffs,

Further information concerning this matter may be addressed to me, telephone 275-5422.

Sincerely yours,

Donald Cl. Supretz

k.

🔺 📔 👘

i.

ł

Donald A. Guritz Attorney-Adviser

