

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 07-1348

IN RE: CAROL A. DIXON,

Petitioner

On Petition for a Writ of Mandamus from the
United States District Court for Eastern
District of Pennsylvania
(Related to E.D. Pa. Civ. No. 01-cv-00619)

Submitted Under Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
February 8, 2007

Before: SLOVITER, CHAGARES AND NYGAARD, CIRCUIT JUDGES

(Filed: February 13, 2007)

OPINION

PER CURIAM

Carol Dixon has filed a petition for a writ of mandamus. Dixon makes several allegations regarding her fear of the “mob” and her belief that she and her family need to be protected. She has attached various documents referencing, inter alia, social security and public assistance benefits, travel accommodations for her daughter and communications with the United States Marshals Service. She appears to request that the

court enforce certain “default judgments” and award her \$300 billion. We must note that her petition is barely comprehensible and at times illegible.

A writ of mandamus will issue only in extraordinary circumstances. See Sporck v. Peil, 759 F.2d 312, 314 (3d Cir. 1985). As a precondition to the issuance of the writ, the petitioner must establish that there is no alternative remedy or other adequate means to obtain the desired relief, and further must demonstrate a clear and indisputable right to the relief sought. Kerr v. United States District Court, 426 U.S. 394, 403 (1976). A writ is not a substitute for an appeal; only if a direct appeal is unavailable will the court determine whether a writ of mandamus will issue. See In Re Ford Motor Co., 110 F.3d 954, 957 (1997).

Dixon’s petition is woefully deficient. To the extent that her allegations are somehow related to pending or closed lawsuits, Dixon has failed to show that alternate remedies do not exist. Dixon had the opportunity to request relief during the pendency of these lawsuits and to appeal any adverse orders that were issued. Moreover, insofar as any of the allegations set forth in her petition have not been raised previously, Dixon may do so by initiating an action in the appropriate court. She has thus failed to demonstrate that she is entitled to the issuance of a writ of mandamus.

Accordingly, we will deny the petition.