

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

Saquan Mann v. PA Parole Board, et al.

Mann · No. 2:24-1015 · Decided December 23, 2025

SUMMARY

This Report and Recommendation addresses Saquan Mann’s 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition challenging the Pennsylvania Parole Board’s denial of parole. The court recommends dismissing the petition as moot because Mann had completed his sentence and been released from Pennsylvania Department of Corrections custody. It also recommends denying a certificate of appealability.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Patricia L. Dodge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania
DECIDED	December 23, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-1015
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 challenging the Pennsylvania Parole Board's denial of parole. Respondents answered and asserted, among other defenses, failure to exhaust state remedies. The magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal as moot and denial of a certificate of appealability.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A certificate of appealability may issue only if the applicant makes a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right; where dismissal rests on mootness, the relevant question is whether jurists of reason would find the mootness determination debatable.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Saquan Mann v. PA Parole Board, Superintendent of SCI Pine Grove

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- subject matter jurisdiction
- constitutional law
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

federal habeas corpus

post-conviction relief

constitutional law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Mann's § 2254 habeas petition became moot after he completed his sentence and was released from Pennsylvania Department of Corrections custody.
2. Whether Mann was entitled to a certificate of appealability.

HOLDINGS

1. Mann's habeas petition is moot because he is no longer incarcerated and the court cannot provide effective relief concerning the challenged denial of parole.
2. Money damages are not available in a habeas proceeding.
3. Mann is not entitled to a certificate of appealability because jurists of reason would not find it debatable that his claims should be dismissed as moot.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Thus, if developments occur during the litigation that eliminate a petitioner's personal stake in the outcome of a suit or prevent a court from granting effective relief, the case must be dismissed as moot." (Discussion section)

"Mann is no longer incarcerated. Thus, there is no relief that this Court can provide to him and this habeas case is now moot." (Discussion section)

"Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully recommended that the Court dismiss the Petition because it is moot and deny a certificate of appealability." (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Mann was incarcerated in Pennsylvania custody while serving a sentence for what he described as drug delivery resulting in death. He filed a § 2254 petition challenging the Pennsylvania Parole Board's denial of parole and sought immediate release to parole, as well as money damages. During the litigation, Mann completed his sentence and was released from Pennsylvania Department of Corrections custody.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Mann filed a § 2254 petition seeking release on parole and money damages. While the petition was pending, he completed his sentence and was released from Pennsylvania Department of Corrections custody. The magistrate judge concluded that no effective habeas relief remained available and recommended dismissal for lack of a live controversy, together with denial of a certificate of appealability. The parties were given fourteen days to object.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Marine v. Quintana, 347 F. App'x 736 (3d Cir. 2009)
- Keitel v. Mazurkiewicz, 729 F.3d 278, 280 (3d Cir. 2013)
- Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 484 (1973)
- Spencer v. Kemna, 523 U.S. 1, 7, 18 (1998)
- Burkey v. Marberry, 556 F.3d 142, 147-48 (3d Cir. 2009)
- Lewis v. Continental Bank Corp., 494 U.S. 472, 477-78 (1990)
- Allen v. Wright, 468 U.S. 737, 750-51 (1984)
- Valley Forge Christian College v. Americans United for Separation of Church & State, Inc., 454 U.S. 464, 471-73 (1982)
- Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)
- EEOC v. City of Long Branch, 866 F.3d 93, 100 (3d Cir. 2017)
- Brightwell v. Lehman, 637 F.3d 187, 193 n.7 (3d Cir. 2011)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-western-district-of-pennsylvania-united-states-district-court-f/2025/saquan-mann-v-pa-parole-board-et-al-y0ko6ffm>