

ARKANSAS SUPREME COURT

No. CR 08-438

DOYLE HOLT, SR.
Petitioner

v.

HON. JODI RAINES DENNIS,
CIRCUIT JUDGE
Respondent

Opinion Delivered June 19, 2008

PRO SE PETITION FOR WRIT OF
MANDAMUS [CIRCUIT COURT OF
JEFFERSON COUNTY, CR 2005-579]

PETITION MOOT.

PER CURIAM

On April 6, 2006, judgment was entered in the Circuit Court of Jefferson County reflecting that petitioner Doyle Holt, Sr., had entered a plea of guilty to multiple felony charges for which he was sentenced to an aggregate term of 160 years' imprisonment. On May 5, 2006, petitioner filed in the trial court a pro se motion to correct the sentence. On April 9, 2008, petitioner filed in this court a pro se petition for writ of mandamus, contending that the Honorable Jodi Raines Dennis, Circuit Judge, had failed to act on the motion in a timely manner. Judge Dennis filed a response to the mandamus petition to which was appended a copy of an order entered April 18, 2008, that disposed of the motion. As there was no reference in the response to the delay of approximately two years in acting on the motion, we requested that an amended response be filed explaining the lengthy delay in acting. *Holt v. Dennis*, CR 08-438 (Ark. May 8, 2008) (per curiam). The amended response is now before us.

Judge Dennis, who sits in the Fifth Division of the Eleventh Judicial District, West, notes that pursuant to the district's Administrative Plan, upon filing, all postconviction pleadings in cases where the petitioner is incarcerated are to be transferred to the district's Second Division. She states that it was thus her responsibility when she received petitioner's motion to have it transferred and that it was her belief that the transfer had occurred until the filing of the mandamus petition alerted her to the error.¹

Inasmuch as the reason for the delay in acting on the motion was a mere error and there is no apparent lack of an efficient plan for assigning cases in the district, there is no cause to request a further response. Petitioner's motion has been acted on by the court, and the mandamus action is now moot.

Petition moot.

¹Petitioner tendered a response to the respondent's response in which he contended that he had written to Judge Dennis. Because this response was tendered only, we will not address it.