



2016 Decisions

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

4-1-2016

In re: Thomas E. Noble

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2016

Recommended Citation

"In re: Thomas E. Noble" (2016). *2016 Decisions*. 346.
http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2016/346

This April 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 2016 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. For more information, please contact Benjamin.Carlson@law.villanova.edu.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 16-1508

In re: THOMAS E. NOBLE,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States District Court for the District of Delaware
(Related to Civ. No. 1:16-cv-00043)

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
March 24, 2016
Before: FUENTES, KRAUSE and SCIRICA, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: April 1, 2016)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

Thomas E. Noble, who is currently facing criminal charges in Delaware Superior Court, filed this pro se petition for a writ of mandamus. He seeks an order directing the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to stay his state-court criminal proceedings pending the resolution of his pre-trial habeas corpus petition, which he filed in the District Court.

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

The day after Noble’s mandamus petition was filed in this Court, the District Court dismissed Noble’s habeas corpus petition. In that order, the District Court also denied as moot Noble’s motion for a stay of the state-court proceedings pending the resolution of his habeas petition. Because the District Court has adjudicated Noble’s request for habeas corpus relief, his mandamus petition—in which he seeks a stay pending the resolution of his habeas proceedings—is now 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.”). We will thus dismiss his request for mandamus relief.