



2015 Decisions

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

4-14-2015

In Re: Jason Smart-El

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2015

Recommended Citation

"In Re: Jason Smart-El" (2015). *2015 Decisions*. 376.
http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2015/376

This April 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 2015 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. 15-1111

IN RE: JASON EMANUEL SMART-EL,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
(Related to D.N.J. Civ. No. 1:13-cv-00164)

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
February 20, 2015

Before: MCKEE, Chief Judge, GARTH and BARRY, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: April 14, 2015)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

Jason Emanuel Smart-El filed a petition for writ of mandamus requesting that we direct the District Court to rule on a motion that he had filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. The District Court has since granted Smart-El's § 2255 motion. In light of the District Court's action, the question Smart-El presented is no longer a live controversy, so we will dismiss the petition as moot. See, e.g., Lusardi v. Xerox Corp., 975 F.2d 964,

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

974 (3d Cir. 1992); see also Blanciak v. Allegheny Ludlum Corp., 77 F.3d 690, 698-99 (3d Cir. 1996) (“If developments occur during the course of adjudication that eliminate a plaintiff’s personal stake in the outcome of a suit or prevent a court from being able to grant the requested relief, the case must be dismissed as moot.”)