



2019 Decisions

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

8-2-2019

In Re: Ralph Reed

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2019

Recommended Citation

"In Re: Ralph Reed" (2019). *2019 Decisions*. 814.

https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2019/814

This August 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 2019 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 19-1615

In re: RALPH REED,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States District Court for the District of Delaware
(Related to D. Del. Civ. No. 1:06-cv-00445)
District Judge: Honorable Leonard P. Stark

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
May 23, 2019
Before: CHAGARES, RESTREPO, and SCIRICA, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: August 2, 2019)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

Convicted by a Delaware jury of murder and a related weapons offense, Ralph Reed is serving a sentence of life plus twenty years in prison. Reed's challenges in federal court to his convictions have thus far been unsuccessful. See, e.g., C.A. No. 08-1330 (3d Cir. Apr. 9, 2008) (denying certificate of appealability request relative to

* 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's dismissal of Reed's federal habeas petition on timeliness grounds); C.A. No. 12-3769 (3d Cir. Feb. 5, 2013) (denying certificate of appealability request relative to District Court's denial of reconsideration of its timeliness ruling).

Presently, Reed has filed a petition for a writ of mandamus. In his petition, Reed states that "this writ is to compel the district court to act, by ruling on his June 2, 2018, motion" to amend the District Court's habeas judgment. Pet. at 2.¹ The referenced motion to amend (ECF 58), however, has since been denied by the District Court. See ECF 69-70.² Reed's mandamus petition is thus moot and will be dismissed. See Blanciak v. Allegheny Ludlum Corp., 77 F.3d 690, 699-700 (3d Cr. 1996).

¹ It appears that, prior to the filing of this mandamus petition, the Clerk of the District Court mistakenly construed Reed's June 2, 2018 motion as a memorandum of law in support of an already-adjudicated motion for reconsideration. See Pet. at 24.

² Reed has appealed the District Court's March 26, 2019 order. That appeal is pending in this Court. See C.A. 19-2007.