



---

2022 Decisions

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

---

7-12-2022

## In Re: Edward McLaughlin

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2022](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2022)

---

### Recommended Citation

"In Re: Edward McLaughlin" (2022). *2022 Decisions*. 508.  
[https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2022/508](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2022/508)

This July 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 2022 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. 21-3367

---

IN RE: EDWARD McLAUGHLIN,  
Petitioner

---

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the  
United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania  
(Related to Crim. No. 3-12-cr-00179-001)

---

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.  
February 3, 2022

Before: CHAGARES, Chief Judge, PORTER and FUENTES, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: July 12, 2022)

---

OPINION\*

---

PER CURIAM

Petitioner Edward McLaughlin filed a mandamus petition requesting that we direct the District Court to rule on his pending motion to vacate his sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. By order entered June 16, 2022, the District Court denied McLaughlin's § 2255 motion in part and granted it in part. That same day, the District Court entered an

---

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

Amended Judgment in McLaughlin's criminal case and sentenced him to 180 months in prison followed by three years supervised release.

In light of the District Court's action, McLaughlin's mandamus petition no longer presents a live controversy. Therefore, we will dismiss it as moot. See Blanciak v. Allegheny Ludlum Corp., 77 F.3d 690, 698-99 (3d Cir. 1996) ("If developments occur during the course of adjudication that . . . prevent a court from being able to grant the requested relief, the case must be dismissed as moot.").