

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 26-2713

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: RESTREPO, PORTER, and MONTGOMERY-REEVES, *Circuit Judges*

(Opinion filed: October 19, 2026)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

Aaron Corbin Mazie filed this “Petition For Writ of Prohibition or Certiorari” under the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), asserting that two federal courts—the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and the United States Court of Federal Claims—have violated his constitutional rights by restricting his access to their filing systems.¹ He asks us to “restore[] ordinary access to the courts and

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

¹ Mazie references (1) this Court’s order denying his prior mandamus petition

prohibit[] the continued application of filing restrictions beyond their lawful scope.” Pet. 1, ECF No. 1-3.

A writ of prohibition or mandamus is an extraordinary remedy that may not be used as a substitute for appeal.² See *In re Diet Drugs Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 418 F.3d 372, 378–79 (3d Cir. 2005). Mandamus should not issue unless the petitioner has “no other adequate means to attain the relief” sought and has shown that his right to the writ is “clear and indisputable.” *Id.* (quoting *Cheney v. United States Dist. Ct.*, 542 U.S. 367, 380–81 (2004)).

Mazie has not shown that he has no other adequate means to attain the relief he seeks because the challenged court orders may be reviewed through the normal appeal process. See, e.g., *Brow v. Farrelly*, 994 F.2d 1027, 1038 (3d Cir. 1993) (asserting appellate jurisdiction over challenge to filing injunction after final order was entered).³ Moreover, because 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), we would not issue a writ of mandamus to the Court of Federal Claims.

challenging the District Court’s orders revoking his privilege to use its Electronic Document Submission Tool (EDS), see C.A. No. 26-1141; and (2) the Court of Federal Claims’ filing injunction in C.A. No. 1:26-cv-00708.

² A petition for a writ of prohibition is governed by the same standard as a mandamus petition. See *United States v. Santtini*, 963 F.2d 585, 593–94 (3d Cir. 1992). Insofar as Mazie’s petition includes a request for a writ of certiorari, we do not have the authority to issue such writ.

³ To the extent that Mazie may be unable to perfect timely appeals of those orders, mandamus relief does not become available merely because he allowed the time for an appeal to expire. See *Oracare DPO, Inc. v. Merin*, 972 F.2d 519, 523 (3d Cir. 1992).

Accordingly, we will deny the petition for a writ of mandamus. All pending motions are denied.