



---

2008 Decisions

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

---

8-1-2008

## USA v. Raghunathan

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2008](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2008)

---

### Recommended Citation

"USA v. Raghunathan" (2008). *2008 Decisions*. 735.  
[https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2008/735](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2008/735)

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 2008 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. 08-1941

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

SRIKANTH RAGHUNATHAN;  
PADMASHRI SAMPATHKUMAR

Appellants

---

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Pennsylvania  
(D.C. Criminal No. 06-CR-00240)  
District Judge: Honorable David Stewart Cercone

---

Submitted for Possible Summary Action  
Pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6  
June 26, 2008  
Before: McKEE, RENDELL and SMITH, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: August 1, 2008)

---

OPINION

---

PER CURIAM

Srikanth Raghunathan and Padmashri Sampathkumar, husband and wife,  
respectively, appeal from an order of the United States District Court for the Western

District of Pennsylvania, which denied their motions to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP). As no substantial question is presented by the appeal, we will summarily affirm the order of the District Court. Third Circuit I.O.P. 10.6.

Rahunathan and Sampathkumar sought authorization from the District Court to proceed IFP in the appeal of a District Court order denying their motions for plea hearing transcripts and sentencing transcripts. Although the District Court denied the motions to proceed IFP, this Court granted the motions that Rahunathan and Sampathkumar presented to this Court to proceed IFP in that appeal. See C.A. No. 07-4800, order entered April 14, 2008.<sup>1</sup> Thus, the question of whether the District Court properly denied the motions is moot. As that is the only question presented by this appeal, we will summarily dismiss the appeal. See United States v. Government of Virgin Islands, 363 F.3d 276, 285 (3d Cir. 2004) (federal court lacks jurisdiction to hear claim that does not present live case or controversy).

---

<sup>1</sup> That order also authorized the couple to proceed IFP in this appeal.