

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

SEP 19 2025

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

In re: JASON EDWARD THOMAS
CARDIFF.

No. 25-5654

D.C. No.
5:23-cr-21-JGB

Central District of California,
Riverside

JASON EDWARD THOMAS CARDIFF,

ORDER

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE,

Respondent,

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Real Party in Interest.

Before: R. NELSON, SUNG, and H.A. THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Petitioner has not demonstrated a clear and indisputable right to the extraordinary remedy of mandamus. *See In re Mersho*, 6 F.4th 891, 897 (9th Cir. 2021) (“To determine whether a writ of mandamus should be granted, we weigh the five factors outlined in *Bauman v. United States District Court.*”); *Bauman v. U.S. Dist. Court*, 557 F.2d 650 (9th Cir. 1977). The petition is denied.

The motion (Docket Entry No. 6) to amend caption is denied as unnecessary.

The motion (Docket Entry Nos. 8 and 9) for a stay is denied as moot.

DENIED.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

JAN 20 2026

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

In re: JASON EDWARD THOMAS
CARDIFF.

No. 25-5654

D.C. No.

5:23-cr-21-JGB

Central District of California,
Riverside

JASON EDWARD THOMAS CARDIFF,

Petitioner,

ORDER

v.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE,

Respondent,

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Real Party in Interest.

Before: R. NELSON, SUNG, and H.A. THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

The motion (Docket Entry No. 11) for reconsideration and reconsideration en banc is denied. *See* 9th Cir. R. 27-10; 9th Cir. Gen. Ord. 6.11.

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.