

MANDATE

E.D.N.Y. – C. Islip
23-cv-6507
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,


25-1810

Petitioner.

Petitioner, pro se, has filed a petition for a writ of mandamus and moves for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis is GRANTED for the purpose of filing the mandamus petition. It is further ORDERED that the mandamus petition is 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




A True Copy

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk

United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit




MANDATE ISSUED ON 03/18/2026