



---

2019 Decisions

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

---

10-30-2019

**In re: Daniel Patrick Sheehan**

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2019](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2019)

---

### **Recommended Citation**

"In re: Daniel Patrick Sheehan" (2019). *2019 Decisions*. 1065.  
[https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2019/1065](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2019/1065)

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 2019 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. 19-2833

---

In re: DANIEL PATRICK SHEEHAN,  
Petitioner

---

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the  
United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania  
(Related to M.D. Pa. Civ. No. 1-18-cv-01748)

---

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.  
September 12, 2019  
Before: SMITH, Chief Judge, AMBRO and ROTH, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: October 30, 2019)

---

OPINION\*

---

PER CURIAM

Daniel Patrick Sheehan was convicted of extortion and using a “destructive device” to commit extortion, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1951 and 924(c)(1)(B)(ii). After unsuccessful challenges to his convictions on direct appeal and in proceedings under 28 U.S.C. § 2255, Sheehan filed a habeas petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 in the District Court. Now, seeking an order from this Court compelling the District Court to

---

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

adjudicate his § 2241 petition, Sheehan has filed a petition for a writ of mandamus. The subject § 2241 petition, however, has since been dismissed by the District Court. See ECF 25-26. Sheehan'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).