



---

2015 Decisions

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

---

11-16-2015

## In Re: Born Rush

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2015](http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2015)

---

### Recommended Citation

"In Re: Born Rush" (2015). *2015 Decisions*. 1191.

[http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2015/1191](http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2015/1191)

This November 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](mailto:Benjamin.Carlson@law.villanova.edu).

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

No. 15-3029

---

In re: BORN ISLAM RUSH,  
Petitioner

---

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the  
United States District Court for the District of New Jersey  
(Related to No. 1-13-cv-04788)

---

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.  
September 3, 2015

Before: McKEE, Chief Judge, GARTH and BARRY, Circuit Judges

(Filed: November 16, 2015)

---

OPINION\*

---

PER CURIAM

Pro se petitioner Born Rush filed a petition for writ of mandamus requesting that we direct the District Court to rule upon his then-pending petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Soon thereafter, the District Court disposed of Rush's § 2241 petition, dismissing it in part and denying it in part. Because the District Court granted Rush the

---

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

relief he requested in his mandamus petition — a decision on his § 2241 petition — his mandamus petition has been rendered moot. See, e.g., Blanciak v. Allegheny Ludlum Corp., 77 F.3d 690, 698-99 (3d Cir. 1996). Accordingly, we will dismiss Rush’s mandamus petition.