



---

2015 Decisions

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

---

6-10-2015

## In Re: Curtis Marshall Dixon

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2015](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2015)

---

### Recommended Citation

"In Re: Curtis Marshall Dixon" (2015). *2015 Decisions*. 593.  
[https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2015/593](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2015/593)

This June 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 2015 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. 15-1358

---

IN RE: CURTIS MARSHALL DIXON,  
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. No. 2:00-cr-00146)  
District Judge: James Knoll Gardner

---

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.  
June 4, 2015

Before: FISHER, SHWARTZ and GREENBERG, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: June 10, 2015)

---

OPINION\*

---

PER CURIAM

Petitioner Curtis Marshall Dixon, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed a petition for writ of mandamus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1651, alleging extraordinary delay in the adjudication of his motion for a writ of error coram nobis by the United States

---

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

District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in E.D. Pa. No. 2:00-cr-00146. Thereafter, on March 17, 2015, the District Court denied the motion. Dixon sought a certificate of appealability, which the District Court also denied. Because the motion has been resolved by the District Court, Dixon has received the relief he sought from this Court, and we will dismiss the 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.”)