

**ARKANSAS SUPREME COURT**

No. CR-11-1186

CHARLES EDWARD GOODWIN  
PETITIONER

v.

HON. EDWIN A. KEATON,  
CIRCUIT JUDGE  
RESPONDENT

**Opinion Delivered** March 29, 2012

PRO SE PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
MANDAMUS [OUACHITA COUNTY  
CIRCUIT COURT, NO. CR 2006-153]

PETITION MOOT.

**PER CURIAM**

In 2007, judgment was entered in the Ouachita County Circuit Court reflecting that petitioner Charles Edward Goodwin had been found guilty by a jury of attempted capital-felony murder with aggravated robbery as the underlying felony offense. A sentence of life imprisonment was imposed. We affirmed. *Goodwin v. State*, 373 Ark. 53, 281 S.W.3d 258 (2008).

On June 4, 2008, petitioner Goodwin timely filed in the trial court a pro se verified petition for postconviction relief pursuant to Arkansas Rule of Criminal Procedure 37.1 (2008). On November 29, 2011, petitioner filed in this court a pro se petition for writ of mandamus, contending that Circuit Judge Edwin A. Keaton had not acted on the Rule 37.1 petition in a timely manner. There was no reference in the response to the delay of approximately three and one-half years in acting on the petition. As it was not clear what circumstances caused the lengthy delay in acting on the Rule 37.1 petition, this court requested the respondent to file an amended response setting out the reasons for the delay. *Goodwin v. Keaton*, 2012 Ark. 28 (per curiam).

The amended response has been received. Judge Keaton explains that the Rule 37.1 petition was inadvertently “set aside” in 2008 when an order was entered on the petitioner’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis, holding that the motion to proceed as an indigent needed no action.

As the respondent has explained the cause of the delay, and the Rule 37.1 petition has been acted on by the court, the mandamus action is moot. We have noted in similar circumstances where there was a lengthy delay in disposing of a pleading that each judicial district should have in place a system whereby each judge is fully aware of the filings on his or her docket. *See, e.g., Cabral v. Keith*, 364 Ark. 456, 220 S.W.3d 683 (2005) (per curiam) (urging all judicial districts to develop a system whereby judges are promptly made aware of filings in their courts); *McCoy v. Phillips*, 357 Ark. 368, 166 S.W.3d 564 (2004) (per curiam) (urging all judicial districts to develop a system whereby judges are made aware of filings in their courts). Prompt resolution of all matters before a court is vital to the administration of justice. *See Higgins v. Proctor*, 2009 Ark. 496 (per curiam).

Petition moot.