

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 26-1576

IN RE: CHAKA KWANZAA,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the
United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
(Related to Civ. No. 1:24-cv-08132)

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
April 2, 2026
Before: KRAUSE, MATEY, and BOVE, *Circuit Judges*

(Opinion filed: June 9, 2026)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

Chaka Kwanzaa, proceeding pro se, filed a petition for a writ of mandamus, requesting that we direct the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey (“the District Court”) to adjudicate his dispute with the Commissioner of Social Security

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

(“Commissioner”) over a reduction in social security benefits and to rule on various other motions.¹ Five days before Kwanzaa filed the mandamus petition, however, the District Court granted the Commissioner’s motion to dismiss, and dismissed Kwanzaa’s complaint without prejudice for failure to exhaust administrative remedies.

In light of the District Court’s action, the question Kwanzaa presented is not a live controversy, so we will dismiss his mandamus petition as moot.² *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.” (citation omitted)).

¹ Kwanzaa later supplemented the mandamus petition with an “Emergency Petition for Writ of Mandamus,” as well as documents in support of the petition.

² Petitioner’s pending motions are denied without prejudice to the Court’s consideration of the identical motions that are pending in Kwanzaa’s appeal docketed at C.A. No. 26-1733.