

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

Julio Brunet v. United States

No. 19-60110, United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit (December 30, 2019)

SUMMARY

Federal prisoner sought writ of mandamus for release and damages; district court's denial affirmed. Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy requiring no other adequate remedy and a clear and indisputable right. Brunet failed to pursue direct appeal or postconviction relief, so he did not meet the standard. No abuse of discretion in denying the petition.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Carl E. Stewart; Stephen A. Higginson; Gregg Costa
JURISDICTION	Federal
DECIDED	December 30, 2019
DOCKET	19-60110
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from the district court's denial of a petition for writ of mandamus.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Abuse of discretion
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished
PARTIES	Julio Armando Brunet v. United States of America

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- appellate procedure
- standard of review
- remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil Procedure
- Appellate Procedure
- Mandamus
- Prisoner Litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court abused its discretion in denying Brunet's petition for a writ of mandamus.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court did not abuse its discretion because Brunet failed to pursue other available remedies and did not show a clear and indisputable right to relief.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy that should be granted only in the clearest and most compelling cases.” (Page 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Julio Armando Brunet, a federal prisoner, sought a writ of mandamus to compel his release from incarceration and to obtain monetary damages from the United States. He had failed to pursue an appeal of his conviction and sentence and still had the option of seeking postconviction relief.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Brunet, a federal prisoner, filed a petition for writ of mandamus in the district court seeking release from incarceration and monetary damages. The district court denied the petition. Brunet appealed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Newsome v. E.E.O.C., 301 F.3d 227, 231 (5th Cir. 2002)
- In re Willy, 831 F.2d 545, 549 (5th Cir. 1987)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

Case: 19-60110 Document: 00515251854 Page: 1 Date Filed: 12/30/2019 IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit No. 19-60110 FILED Summary Calendar December 30, 2019 Lyle W. Cayce Clerk JULIO ARMANDO BRUNET, Plaintiff-Appellant v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant-Appellee Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi USDC No. 3:18-CV-456 Before STEWART, HIGGINSON, and COSTA, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM: * Julio Armando Brunet, federal prisoner # 05079-104, appeals the district court’s denial of his petition for a writ of mandamus seeking an order releasing him from incarceration and directing the United States to pay him monetary damages. A district court’s determination that it will not exercise its discretion to grant a petition for mandamus is reviewed for an abuse of discretion.

Newsome * Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4. Case: 19-60110 Document: 00515251854 Page: 2 Date Filed: 12/30/2019 No. 19-60110 v. E.E.O.C., 301 F.3d 227, 231 (5th Cir. 2002). “Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy that should be granted only in the clearest and most compelling cases.” In re Willy, 831 F.2d 545, 549 (5th Cir.

1987). A party seeking mandamus relief must show both that he has no other adequate means to obtain the requested relief and that he has a “clear and indisputable” right to the writ. Id. (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Brunet failed to pursue properly his opportunity to appeal his conviction and sentence that he challenges, and he continues to have an option of seeking postconviction relief.

He is not entitled to mandamus relief because he failed to pursue remedies that were and may be available to him. Id. Further, Brunet has not shown a clear and indisputable right to relief. Id. He has failed to demonstrate that the district court abused its discretion in denying his petition for a writ of mandamus.

The judgment of the district court is **AFFIRMED**. 2