



2018 Decisions

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

7-9-2018

In Re: Keyon Freeland

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2018

Recommended Citation

"In Re: Keyon Freeland" (2018). *2018 Decisions*. 553.
https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2018/553

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 2018 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. 18-2097

IN RE: KEYON FREELAND,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
(Related to M.D. Pa. No. 3-15-cv-00965)

Submitted Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 21
June 21, 2018
Before: RESTREPO, BIBAS and NYGAARD, Circuit Judges

(Filed: July 9, 2018)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

State prisoner Keyon Freeland, proceeding pro se, seeks a writ of mandamus in connection with a habeas petition he filed in the District Court. For the reasons that follow, we will dismiss Freeland's mandamus petition as moot.

In May 2015, Freeland filed a habeas petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 in the District Court (he subsequently filed an amended habeas petition in July 2015). On May

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

18, 2018, Freeland filed this mandamus petition, asking that we direct the District Court to rule on his habeas petition. A few weeks later, on May 30, 2018, the District Court issued a memorandum and order, denying Freeland's habeas petition.

Because Freeland has now obtained the relief he sought, an adjudication of his habeas petition, his mandamus petition is moot. See Blanciak v. Allegheny Ludlum Corp., 77 F.3d 690, 698-99 (3d Cir. 1996). We will therefore dismiss it.