



2015 Decisions

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

12-16-2015

In Re: Harry Colyer

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2015

Recommended Citation

"In Re: Harry Colyer" (2015). *2015 Decisions*. 1301.

https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2015/1301

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 2015 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. 15-3442

IN RE: HARRY DEAN COLYER,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania
(Related to W.D. Pa. Civ. No. 3-14-cv-00066)

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
November 24, 2015
Before: FUENTES, KRAUSE and SCIRICA, Circuit Judges

(Filed: December 16, 2015)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

Harry Dean Colyer is a Pennsylvania prisoner proceeding pro se. In April 2014, Colyer filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 in the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. The matter was assigned to a Magistrate Judge who ordered the Commonwealth to show cause why the writ should not be granted. See Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. The

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

Commonwealth submitted its answer in June 2014, and Colyer submitted a reply the following month.

In October 2015, Colyer filed the present petition for writ of mandamus asking this Court to compel the District Court to rule on his habeas petition.¹ Shortly after the mandamus petition was docketed here, the Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending that the petition be denied.² As of the date of this opinion, the District Court has not yet ruled on the petition.

Our jurisdiction derives from 28 U.S.C. § 1651, which grants us the power to “issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of (our) . . . jurisdiction and agreeable to the usages and principles of law.” A writ of mandamus is an extreme remedy that is invoked only in extraordinary situations. See Kerr v. U.S. Dist. Court, 426 U.S. 394, 402 (1976). An appellate court may issue a writ of mandamus when an “undue delay is tantamount to a failure to exercise jurisdiction,” Madden v. Myers, 102 F.3d 74, 79 (3d Cir. 1996), superseded in part on other grounds by 3d Cir. L.A.R. 24.1(c), but a district court generally retains discretion over the manner in which it controls its docket, In re Fine Paper Antitrust Litig., 685 F.2d 810, 817 (3d Cir. 1982).

¹ Colyer initially filed this mandamus petition in the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. The District Court subsequently transferred it here. See 28 U.S.C. § 1631.

² The Magistrate Judge also denied a letter-motion that Colyer addressed to the District Court Clerk in March 2015 requesting a “more timely disposition” of his petition. (Mot. 1, ECF No. 7.)

We recognize Colyer's concern that no action had been taken in his case for over a year. However, given that the Magistrate Judge has now issued a Report and Recommendation, we are confident that the District Court will review the Report and Recommendation and adjudicate the habeas petition in a timely manner. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Therefore, we conclude that our intervention is not warranted at this time.

Accordingly, we will deny the mandamus petition.