

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 26-3175

IN RE: ALBERT SEDGES,
Petitioner

On a Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the
United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
(Related to Civ. No. 3:26-cv-08668)
District Judge: Honorable Michael A. Shipp

Submitted Pursuant to Rule 21, Fed. R. App. P.
September 3, 2026
Before: SHWARTZ, FREEMAN, and CHUNG, *Circuit Judges*

(Opinion filed: September 16, 2026)

OPINION*

PER CURIAM

Albert Sedges has filed a petition for a writ of mandamus. For the reasons that follow, we will deny the petition as moot.

On July 14, 2026, Sedges filed a complaint in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. The next day, he filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis.

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

In August 2026, Sedges filed a mandamus petition requesting that we order the District Court to act on his motion to proceed in forma pauperis. On August 26, 2026, the District Court granted the motion to proceed in forma pauperis and dismissed the complaint without prejudice for failure to state a claim.

As the District Court has now acted on the motion to proceed in forma pauperis, Sedges' request for mandamus relief is moot. *See Blanciak v. Allegheny Ludlum Corp.*, 77 F.3d 690, 698-99 (3d Cir. 1996) (noting that “[i]f developments occur during the course of adjudication that . . . prevent a court from being able to grant the requested relief, the case must be dismissed as moot”).

For the above reason, we will deny the mandamus petition as moot.