



2022 Decisions

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

12-8-2022

In Re: David Hatchigian

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

Recommended Citation

"In Re: David Hatchigian" (2022). *2022 Decisions*. 1006.

https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2022/1006

This December 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.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 22-2211

IN RE: DAVID HATCHIGIAN AND JOAN RANDAZZO

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
(Related to Civ. No. 2:21-cv-03416)

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
November 10, 2022

Before: AMBRO, KRAUSE, and PORTER, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: December 8, 2022)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

In March 2022, following an adverse jury verdict in a civil action, Petitioners David Hatchigian and Joan Randazzo filed a motion in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania seeking a new trial or, in the alternative, to alter or amend the judgment. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 59. In July 2022, Petitioners submitted a

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

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 Rule 59 motion. By order entered September 6, 2022, the District Court denied the motion.

In light of the District Court’s action, Petitioners’ mandamus petition no longer presents a live controversy. Therefore, we will dismiss it 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 . . . prevent a court from being able to grant the requested relief, the case must be dismissed as moot.”).