Richard Valenciano v. Warden FCI Edgefield Appeal: 14-7901 Doc: 11 Filed: 06/06/2017 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 406554374

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEAL	S
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT	

	No. 14-7901		
RICHARD VALENCIANO,			
Petitioner - Ap	ppellant,		
v.			
WARDEN FCI EDGEFIELD,			
Respondent - A	Appellee,		
and			
WARDEN THOMAS,			
Respondent.			
-			
Appeal from the United States I Charleston. R. Bryan Harwell, Dis			th Carolina, at
Submitted: May 2, 2017		Decide	d: June 6, 2017
Before MOTZ, DUNCAN, and DIA	AZ, Circuit Judges.		
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.		
Richard Valenciano, Appellant Pro	Se.		

Appeal: 14-7901 Doc: 11 Filed: 06/06/2017 Pg: 2 of 3

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Richard Valenciano, a former federal prisoner, has appealed the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2012) petition. In the petition, he challenged his sentence as an armed career criminal, arguing that one of his predicate prior convictions was no longer a qualifying violent felony. While this appeal was pending, the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico granted Valenciano's authorized successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion based on *Johnson v. United States*, 135 S. Ct. 2551 (2015). He was resentenced and released from custody, and he is currently on supervised release. "Mootness is a jurisdictional question and thus may be raised *sua sponte* by a federal court at any stage of proceedings." *United States v. Springer*, 715 F.3d 535, 540 (4th Cir. 2013) (citation omitted). Because Valenciano has already been granted the relief that he sought in his § 2241 petition, we conclude that the appeal is moot. *See also United States v. Surratt*, __ F.3d __, No. 14-6851, 2017 WL 1423296 (4th Cir. Apr. 21, 2017) (dismissed as moot following en banc argument).

Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss the appeal as moot. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED