## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

\_\_\_\_\_

No. 15-1358

\_\_\_\_\_

IN RE: CURTIS MARSHALL DIXON,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (Related to E.D. Pa. No. 2:00-cr-00146) District Judge: James Knoll Gardner

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P. June 4, 2015

Before: FISHER, SHWARTZ and GREENBERG, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: June 10, 2015)

\_\_\_\_\_

OPINION\*

## PER CURIAM

Petitioner Curtis Marshall Dixon, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed a petition for writ of mandamus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1651, alleging extraordinary delay in the adjudication of his motion for a writ of error coram nobis by the United States

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

District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in E.D. Pa. No. 2:00-cr-00146. Thereafter, on March 17, 2015, the District Court denied the motion. Dixon sought a certificate of appealability, which the District Court also denied. Because the motion has been resolved by the District Court, Dixon has received the relief he sought from this Court, and we will dismiss the mandamus petition as 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 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.")