

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 26-3173

IN RE: WENDY N. PALMER,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the
United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
(Related to E.D. Pa. Civ. No. 2:26-cv-02466)

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
September 17, 2026
Before: *CHAGARES, Chief Judge, SHWARTZ, and RESTREPO, Circuit Judges*
(Opinion filed: October 7, 2026)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

Pro se petitioner Wendy N. Palmer petitions for a writ of mandamus asking us to intervene in her civil action filed in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. We decline to issue the requested writ.

Palmer's pending action in the District Court asserts a multitude of claims arising from a mortgage transaction and foreclosure action. Since the action commenced, the

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

District Court has, inter alia, denied without prejudice Palmer's request to proceed in forma pauperis, revoked Palmer's electronic filing privileges due to numerous frivolous filings, and denied Palmer's default judgment requests. Meanwhile, the District Court Clerk reassigned the case to District Judge Sánchez and, according to Palmer, has refused to issue subpoenas.

Palmer is now asking us to direct the District Court to: (1) "State on the record the operative Rule 12(a), Rule 12(b)(6), and Rule 55(a)/(b) determinations and rule on [her] pending Rule 55 motions"; (2) "Identify the authority supporting the Clerk's refusal to issue subpoenas or clarify the status of any such restriction"; (3) "State the authority, findings, and operative basis for the filing restriction . . . and identify a lawful filing mechanism"; (4) "Record the basis, effective date, and administrative authority for reassignment and clarify whether [the filing restriction] remained operative thereafter"; and (5) "Maintain an accurate docket and state the disposition of Petitioner's pending in forma pauperis application."

"The writ of mandamus is an extreme remedy reserved for only the most extraordinary situations." *In re Abbott Lab's*, 96 F.4th 371, 379 (3d Cir. 2024) (citation modified). The petitioner must show: "(1) a clear and indisputable abuse of discretion or error of law, (2) a lack of an alternate avenue for adequate relief, and (3) a likelihood of irreparable injury." *Id.* (citation omitted). A writ of mandamus may be warranted where "undue delay is tantamount to a failure to exercise jurisdiction." *Madden v. Myers*, 102 F.3d 74, 79 (3d Cir. 1996). But a "court's decision whether to issue the writ is largely one of discretion." *Haines v. Liggett Grp. Inc.*, 975 F.2d 81, 89 (3d Cir. 1992).

Palmer has not demonstrated that she is entitled to such extraordinary relief. To the extent that Palmer asks us to compel a ruling on any pending motion or other request for relief, we discern no undue delay tantamount to a failure to exercise jurisdiction and are confident that the District Court will adjudicate the proceedings in due course. *See Madden*, 102 F.3d at 79. Insofar as she seeks clarification on any of the District Court's rulings to date, Palmer has not shown why she is unable to obtain such relief in the District Court. *See Abbott Lab 'ys*, 96 F.4th at 379. And to the extent that Palmer wishes to challenge any of the District Court's decisions thus far, Palmer has failed to demonstrate that she will suffer irreparable injury or is unable to seek adequate relief by appeal. *See id.*

Accordingly, we will deny the petition for a writ of mandamus.¹

¹ Palmer's motion for an injunction and stay pending resolution of the mandamus petition, and Palmer's motion for leave to file electronically in this Court, are denied as unnecessary. Palmer's request for judicial notice of her amended complaint in the District Court is also denied.