## IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

APR 2 9 2008

No. 08-20213 USDC No. 4:07-CV-3809

OHANLES A. FULLIMINALE I

IN RE: DOROTHY CATO, CHRISTOPHER CATO, DAVID-WYNN MILLER

Petitioners

Petition for a Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas UNITED STATES COURTS SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FILED

MAY 0 7 2008

MICHAEL N. MILEY, GLERK OF GOURT

Before KING, WIENER, and ELROD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Dorothy Cato, Christopher Cato, and David-Wynn Miller have filed in this court a pro se petition for a writ of mandamus. We are unable to discern from their incoherent pleadings just what relief they seek from this court. Because they reference the above-cited district court number, we assume that they have some complaint concerning that lawsuit.

In district court, the petitioners sued more than 30 defendants in a pleading labeled "Quo-Warranto-Complaint." The assertions in the "quowarranto-complaint" were lengthy but incoherent, and several defendants filed pleadings indicating that they were unable to ascertain what claims were presented. On November 29, 2007, the district court dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim. The petitioners have not appealed that judgment. They did continue to file further "quo-warranto-complaints" in the district court; that

## No. 08-20213

court denied two such pleadings and then ordered that any further papers filed by the petitioners were "automatic nullities when filed."

Our mandamus jurisdiction is generally limited to situations in which the district court "has exceeded its jurisdiction or has declined to exercise it," or in which the district court "has so clearly and indisputably abused its discretion as to compel prompt intervention by the appellate court." *In re United States*, 397 F.3d 274, 282 (5th Cir. 2005). Mandamus is not a substitute for appeal. *Id.* at 283. Because the petitioners' case is no longer pending in district court, we lack authority to issue a writ of mandamus pertaining to that case.

The petition for a writ of mandamus is DENIED.

A true copy Attest:	$\sim$
Clerk, U. S. Court of Ar	petris, Fifth Circuit
New Orleander, Louisian	eputy

Case 4:07-cv-03809 Document 37 Filed in TXSD on 05/07/08 Page 3 of 3

## United States Court of Appeals

FIFTH CIRCUIT OFFICE OF THE CLERK

CHARLES R. FULBRUGE III CLERK TEL. 504-310-7700 600 S. MAESTRI PLACE NEW ORLEANS, LA 70130

April 30, 2008

Mr Michael N Milby, Clerk Southern District of Texas, Houston United States District Court Room 1217 515 Rusk Street Houston, TX 77002

> No. 08-20213 In Re: Cato USDC No. 4:07-CV-3809

Enclosed is a certified copy of the judgment issued as the mandate.

Sincerely,

CHARLES R. FULBRUGE III, Clerk Jem de Montlein By:

James deMontluzin, Deputy Clerk 504-310-7679

cc: w/encl: Mr Christopher Cato Ms Dorothy Cato Mr David-Wynn Miller

MDT-1