

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 24-1634

IN RE: SANDRA RUMANEK,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus from the
United States District Court for the District of Delaware
(Related to D. Del. Civ. No. 1:17-cv-00123 & D. Del. Civ. No. 1:12-cv-00759)

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.

May 23, 2024

Before: HARDIMAN, MONTGOMERY-REEVES, and NYGAARD, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: June 5, 2024)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

Sandra Rumanek again petitions for a writ of mandamus to challenge rulings by the District Court in closed employment and civil-rights cases in which she is enjoined from filing anything new. See Pet. at 20 (“Justice requires the Court grant Rumanek’s petition, vacate the courts’ prior rulings in these matters, and order and/or direct

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

judgment for Rumanek on all claims . . .”). In an earlier opinion, we explained to Rumanek that mandamus is a drastic remedy available only in extraordinary circumstances, that it is not a substitute for an appeal, and that Rumanek had not satisfied the standard for obtaining mandamus relief. See In re Rumanek, C.A. No. 23-2724, 2023 WL 7410370, at *1 (3d Cir. Nov. 9, 2023) (per curiam) (citing, among other decisions, In re Diet Drugs Prods. Liab. Litig., 418 F.3d 372, 378 (3d Cir. 2005), and Westinghouse Elec. Corp. v. Republic of Philippines, 951 F.2d 1414, 1422 (3d Cir. 1991)). To repeat that explanation is to provide sufficient grounds to reject Rumanek’s current mandamus petition. And on the topic of repetition: Rumanek is now instructed for the third—and final—time that “further meritless appellate filings will result in monetary sanctions.” Id. (quoting Rumanek v. Indep. Sch. Mgmt. Inc., CA No. 22-2541, 2022 WL 18859515, at *1 (3d Cir. Nov. 4, 2022) (non-precedential order)). With that said, the current mandamus petition will be denied.