

Cite as 2018 Ark. 121  
**SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS**  
No. CR-17-857

BART WOODARD

PETITIONER

V.

HONORABLE MARK LINDSAY,  
CIRCUIT JUDGE

RESPONDENT

Opinion Delivered APRIL 12, 2018

PRO SE PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
MANDAMUS  
[WASHINGTON COUNTY CIRCUIT  
COURT, NO. 72CR-11-1271]

PETITION MOOT.

---

**ROBIN F. WYNNE, Associate Justice**

On October 17, 2017, petitioner Bart Woodard filed in this court a pro se petition for writ of mandamus, contending that Circuit Judge Mark Lindsay had not acted in a timely manner on his pro se petition for reduction of sentence filed in the Washington County Circuit Court on December 16, 2015. Judge Lindsay filed a response to the mandamus petition to which was appended a copy of an order entered October 11, 2017, that had disposed of the petition to correct sentence.

Because there was no reference in the response to the delay of approximately twenty-two months in acting on the petition, and it was not clear what circumstances caused the lengthy delay in acting on it, the respondent was requested to file an amended response setting out the reasons for the delay. *Woodard v. Lindsay*, 2018 Ark. 40. The amended response is now before us.

Judge Lindsay states in the amended response that the delay in acting on Woodard's petition was caused by a lapse in docket control occasioned by a change in the office staff to which tasks involving pro se mail and pleadings had been delegated. Judge Lindsay further states that the lapse was a one-time occurrence and that steps have been taken to see that such a delay does not reoccur.

Inasmuch as it seems that the delay in this matter may have been a consequence of a failure to have appropriate procedures in place and this failure has been addressed by the respondent, no further action appears to be required concerning the court's procedures for prompt handling of pleadings. Accordingly, we address Woodard's petition for mandamus and declare that it is moot because the underlying petition has been acted on by the circuit court. *See Griffin v. Alexander*, 2017 Ark. 235 (when the court had acted in the matter, the petition for writ of mandamus was moot.).

Petition moot.