



2017 Decisions

Opinions of the United
States Court of Appeals
for the Third Circuit

2-7-2017

In Re: Dennis Mayer

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2017

Recommended Citation

"In Re: Dennis Mayer" (2017). *2017 Decisions*. 132.
http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2017/132

This February is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2017 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. For more information, please contact Benjamin.Carlson@law.villanova.edu.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 16-4205

IN RE: DENNIS JAMES MAYER,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania
(Related to W.D. Pa. Civ. No. 1-15-cv-00232)

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
January 19, 2017
Before: CHAGARES, VANASKIE and KRAUSE, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: February 7, 2017)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

Pro se petitioner Dennis James Mayer seeks a writ of mandamus to compel the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania to issue a final appealable order in his federal habeas case.¹

* This disposition is not an opinion of the full Court and pursuant to I.O.P. 5.7 does not constitute binding precedent.

¹ We previously dismissed Mayer's appeal of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation for lack of jurisdiction. See C.A. No. 16-3338.

By order entered on December 9, 2016, the District Court granted Respondents' motion to dismiss, denied Mayer's habeas petition, and declined to issue a certificate of appealability. Because Mayer has now received the relief he requested in his mandamus petition – a final, appealable order – we will dismiss his mandamus petition as moot. See Blanciak v. Allegheny Ludlum Corp., 77 F.3d 690, 698-99 (3d Cir. 1996).