



2019 Decisions

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

1-23-2019

In Re: Corey Lane

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2019

Recommended Citation

"In Re: Corey Lane" (2019). *2019 Decisions*. 74.

https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2019/74

This January 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 2019 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 18-3834

In re: COREY LANE, Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
(Related to Civ. No. 2-16-cv-08948)

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
January 10, 2019

Before: AMBRO, KRAUSE and PORTER, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: January 23, 2019)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

Pro se petitioner Corey Lane has filed a petition for writ of mandamus requesting that we direct the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey to rule on separate motions for default judgment that he allegedly filed on May 1 and 3, 2018. He previously filed a nearly identical mandamus petition asking for the same relief. We denied the petition, explaining that the District Court had already denied the May 1, 2018

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

motion and that there was no indication that Lane had filed a second motion on May 3, 2018. See In re Lane, 740 F. App'x 768 (3d Cir. 2018) (per curiam) (non-precedential opinion). We reach the same conclusion here. Lane has already obtained the requested ruling on the May 1, 2018 motion, and if he “believes that the failure to docket his May 3 motion was in error (despite the District Court’s order denying his motion for entry of default judgment, see Dkt. #103), he may raise that issue in the District Court.” Id. at 769.¹ Accordingly, we will deny Lane’s mandamus petition.

¹ We note that the District Court has promptly ruled on Lane’s sundry filings in this case, and we have twice affirmed the Court’s orders denying his requests for injunctive relief. See Lane v. New Jersey, -- F. App'x ---, 2018 WL 4922815 (3d Cir. Oct. 10, 2018) (per curiam) (non-precedential opinion); Lane v. New Jersey, 725 F. App'x 185 (3d Cir. 2018) (per curiam) (non-precedential opinion).