

MANDATE

E.D.N.Y. – C. Islip
20-cv-3361
Bulsara, J.
Shields, M.J.

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE
SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 21st day of November, two thousand twenty-five.

Present:

Amalya L. Kearse,
Reena Raggi,
Raymond J. Lohier, Jr.,
Circuit Judges.

In Re: Lidia M. Orrego,

25-1802 (L),
25-2399 (Con)

Petitioner.

Petitioner, pro se, has filed petitions for a writ of mandamus and moves for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in these consolidated petitions. Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis are GRANTED for the purpose of filing the mandamus petitions. It is further ORDERED that the mandamus petitions are DENIED because Petitioner has not demonstrated that she lacks an adequate, alternative means of obtaining relief, that her right to the writ is clear and indisputable, and that granting the writ is appropriate under the circumstances. *See Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for D.C.*, 542 U.S. 367, 380–81 (2004).

FOR THE COURT:
Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk of Court


Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe

A True Copy

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk

United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit


Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe

MANDATE ISSUED ON 03/18/2026