



2015 Decisions

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

6-16-2015

In re: Mychael Saunders

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

Recommended Citation

"In re: Mychael Saunders" (2015). *2015 Decisions*. 623.
http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2015/623

This June 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. For more information, please contact Benjamin.Carlson@law.villanova.edu.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 14-4426

IN RE: MYCHAEL SAUNDERS,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
(Related to D.C. Crim. Action No. 2:08-cr-00165-001)

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
December 11, 2014

Before: MCKEE, GARTH and BARRY, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: June 16, 2015)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

Pro se petitioner Mychael Saunders filed a petition for a writ of mandamus,
seeking to compel the United States District Court for the Eastern District of

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

Pennsylvania to rule on his motion to vacate his sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. Thereafter, on April 15, 2015, the District Court entered an order ruling on Saunders's § 2255 motion. In light of the District Court's action, the case before us is no longer a live controversy, so we will dismiss the petition for writ of mandamus as moot. See, e.g., Lusardi v. Xerox Corp., 975 F.2d 964, 974 (3d Cir. 1992); see also Blanciak v. Allegheny Ludlum Corp., 77 F.3d 690, 698-99 (3d Cir. 1996) (“If developments occur during the course of adjudication that eliminate a plaintiff's personal stake in the outcome of a suit or prevent a court from being able to grant the requested relief, the case must be dismissed as moot.”)