



2013 Decisions

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

6-10-2013

In Re: David Lusick

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2013

Recommended Citation

"In Re: David Lusick " (2013). *2013 Decisions*. 712.

https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2013/712

This decision 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 2013 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. 13-1824

IN RE: DAVID GEORGE LUSICK,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
(Related to Civ. No. 12-cv-05150)

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
May 9, 2013
Before: AMBRO, SMITH and CHAGARES, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: June 10, 2013)

OPINION

PER CURIAM

David Lusick has filed a petition for a writ of mandamus, seeking that we order the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to consider a complaint he says he filed on September 1, 2012—a complaint that the District Court said it did not receive.¹ He also asks us to order that Court to serve and consider some of his other filings, and reassign a different judge to his District Court proceedings.

¹ Although it is not clear whether the District Court ever received Lusick's complaint in 2012, we would remind the District Court that if it denies an applicant's motion to

We will deny Lusick's petition. Since the time Lusick filed his mandamus petition, he has complied with the District Court's order to file a new complaint. The District Court has also randomly reassigned the proceedings to another judge. Thus, those requests are moot. We are confident that the District Court will also serve and/or consider Lusick's other filings, to the extent it deems appropriate. If Lusick is unhappy with any of the District Court's rulings, he can raise those issues on appeal. See Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct., 542 U.S. 367, 380-81 (2004) (mandamus is not a substitute for appeal).²

proceed in forma pauperis, it should retain the unfiled complaint until any appeals are complete.

² Lusick's remaining motions in this Court are denied.