

Masthead Logo

2019 Decisions

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

2-12-2019

In Re: Dee Farmer

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

Recommended Citation

"In Re: Dee Farmer" (2019). *2019 Decisions*. 152.

https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2019/152

This February 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. For more information, please contact Benjamin.Carlson@law.villanova.edu.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 18-3345

IN RE: DEE DEIDRE FARMER,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
(Related to Civ. No. 16-cv-06141)

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
January 31, 2019

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

(Opinion filed: February 12, 2019)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

On October 22, 2018, Dee Deirdre Farmer filed a petition for writ of mandamus to compel the District Court to adjudicate her September 14, 2017 motions to proceed in forma pauperis and to reopen proceedings in her civil rights action. But by order entered April 30, 2018, the District Court had already decided Farmer's motions, so we must in

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

turn dismiss her mandamus petition 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 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.”).

If Farmer wishes to reopen her case in the District Court, she should file a motion to reopen that complies with the instructions in the District Court’s order entered on April 30, 2018, with an explanation why her motion is being filed past the deadline set by that court. The Clerk of this Court is directed to send Farmer a copy of the April 30, 2018 order along with this opinion.¹

¹ Farmer’s motion for appointment of counsel is denied.