

**SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS**

No. 10-102

WILLIE WELLS III  
PETITIONER

V.

HON. DAVID N. LASER, CIRCUIT  
JUDGE  
RESPONDENT

Opinion Delivered March 18, 2010

PRO SE PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
MANDAMUS [CIRCUIT COURT OF  
CRITTENDEN COUNTY, CV 2009-  
640]

PETITION MOOT AS TO NAMED  
RESPONDENT.

---

**PER CURIAM**

On October 5, 2009, petitioner Willie Wells III filed a civil complaint in Crittenden County Circuit Court. On February 2, 2010, petitioner filed in this court a pro se petition seeking a writ of mandamus and alleging that the Honorable David N. Laser had failed to act in a timely manner in regard to rulings and scheduling in the matter. Petitioner asks that this court order Judge Laser to provide rulings. In particular, petitioner would have the judge grant a request for an arrest warrant, grant the relief requested in petitioner's complaint, and schedule a court date.

Judge Laser first filed as a response to the petition a copy of an order that had been filed in circuit court. The order denied relief as to one of the pleadings mentioned in the petition and transferred the case for scheduling to another judge. The attorney general later filed a response on behalf of Judge Laser that referenced the same order and asserted that the petition for the writ was moot.

Cite as 2010 Ark. 142

Petitioner may not seek to compel any particular ruling through mandamus. The writ will not lie to control or review matters of discretion. *Ark. Democrat-Gazette v. Zimmerman*, 341 Ark. 771, 20 S.W.3d 301 (2000). As to the broader relief petitioner seeks through the writ, to simply compel a final disposition of the matter, Judge Laser is no longer the proper party to provide that relief.

Although the order did not fully dispose of the litigation pending in circuit court, because the matter has been transferred to another judge for final resolution, the matter is moot as to Judge Laser. Mandamus runs to a particular judge rather than a court. *State v. Vittitow*, 358 Ark. 98, 186 S.W.3d 237 (2004) (citing *Hogrobrooks v. Routon*, 321 Ark. 654, 906 S.W.2d 687 (1995) (per curiam)).

Petition moot as to named respondent.

*Willie Wells III*, pro se petitioner.

No response.