



---

2019 Decisions

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

---

1-25-2019

**In Re: Anthony Fletcher**

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2019](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2019)

---

**Recommended Citation**

"In Re: Anthony Fletcher" (2019). *2019 Decisions*. 85.  
[https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2019/85](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2019/85)

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. 18-3603

---

IN RE: ANTHONY FLETCHER,  
Petitioner

---

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the  
United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania  
(Related to E.D. Pa. Civ. No. 2:10-cv-03188)

---

Submitted Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 21  
January 17, 2019

Before: JORDAN, GREENAWAY, JR. and NYGAARD, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: January 25, 2019)

---

OPINION\*

---

PER CURIAM

Pro se petitioner Anthony Fletcher seeks a writ of mandamus to compel the District Court to hold a hearing on a motion he filed regarding his appointed counsel in his underlying habeas proceedings in the District Court. Fletcher filed his mandamus petition in November 2018. By order entered December 3, 2018, the District Court

---

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

denied his motion. In light of the District Court's action, Fletcher's request regarding his now-resolved motion is moot.

To the extent that Fletcher vaguely seeks "reassignment in the alternative," see Mandamus Petition at ECF p. 3, he has not demonstrated his entitlement to the extraordinary remedy of mandamus relief. See Hollingsworth v. Perry, 558 U.S. 183, 190 (2010) (per curiam) ("Before a writ of mandamus may issue, a party must establish that (1) no other adequate means [exist] to attain the relief he desires, (2) the party's right to issuance of the writ is clear and indisputable, and (3) the writ is appropriate under the circumstances.") (internal quotation marks omitted). Accordingly, we will dismiss Fletcher's petition.