

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 26-2529

IN RE: AARON CORBIN MAZIE,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus

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

September 17, 2026
Before: BIBAS, PHIPPS, and NYGAARD, *Circuit Judges*

(Opinion filed: September 23, 2026)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

Aaron Corbin Mazie filed this petition for a writ of prohibition, which he has since supplemented, asking us to intervene in various New Jersey court proceedings because, he contends, they stem from his unlawful arrest in February 2024. He references a Municipal Court matter and “additional associated restraining-order proceedings,

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

derivative complaints, municipal proceedings, or related prosecutorial matters arising from the same operative events.” Pet. 2, ECF No. 1-3.

We will deny the petition. A writ of prohibition or mandamus is a “drastic remedy that a court should grant only in extraordinary circumstances in response to an act amounting to a judicial usurpation of power.”¹ *Hahnemann Univ. Hosp. v. Edgar*, 74 F.3d 456, 461 (3d Cir. 1996) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted). We can use our mandamus power only “in aid of” our potential appellate jurisdiction. *United States v. Christian*, 660 F.2d 892, 894 (3d Cir. 1981). Because federal Courts of Appeal “lack jurisdiction over their state counterparts,” writs of mandamus directed to state courts are generally inappropriate. *In re Richards*, 213 F.3d 773, 781 (3d Cir. 2000). For these reasons, we cannot issue a writ of prohibition or mandamus to interfere with Mazie’s state-court proceedings.

Accordingly, we will deny Mazie’s petition. All pending motions are denied.

¹ See also *United States v. Santtini*, 963 F.2d 585, 593-94 (3d Cir. 1992) (explaining that a petition for a writ of prohibition is governed by the same standard as a mandamus petition).