



2022 Decisions

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

10-31-2022

In Re: Dennis Walls

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2022

Recommended Citation

"In Re: Dennis Walls" (2022). *2022 Decisions*. 849.

https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2022/849

This October 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 2022 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

HLD-001

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 22-2773

IN RE: DENNIS LEE WALLS,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
(Related to Civ. No. 3-19-cv-01288)

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
October 6, 2022

Before: CHAGARES, Chief Judge, HARDIMAN, and PHIPPS, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: October 31, 2022)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

In July 2019, Dennis Walls filed a habeas petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania. In September 2022, Wells filed a petition for a writ of mandamus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1651 with this Court, requesting an order directing the District Court to rule on the petition and a pending bail motion, to appoint counsel, and to conduct a hearing on his claims.

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

In an order entered October 4, 2022, the District Court denied the § 2254 petition, declined to issue a certificate of appealability, and dismissed the bail motion as moot. Thus, to the extent that Walls sought a ruling on his petition and motion, he has obtained the relief he requested. And because the matter has been dismissed, an order directing the District Court to hold a hearing or appoint counsel would have no effect on the proceedings. Because there is no effective relief we can grant him, his request for mandamus relief is moot, and we will dismiss the petition. See Blanciak v. Allegheny Ludlum Corp., 77 F.3d 690, 698-99 (3d Cir. 1996) (noting that “[i]f 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”).