

FILED

United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

April 15, 2026

FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

Christopher M. Wolpert
Clerk of Court

In re: GANIYU AYINLA JAIYEOLA,

Petitioner.

No. 26-3037
(D.C. No. 2:25-MC-00217-EFM)
(D. Kan.)

ORDER

Before **EID**, **KELLY**, and **ROSSMAN**, Circuit Judges.

This matter is before the court on Ganiyu Ayinla Jaiyeola’s pro se petition for a writ of mandamus. In 2023, the district court imposed filing restrictions against Jaiyeola, prohibiting him from filing new pleadings without court authorization.¹ Jaiyeola takes issue with the district court’s denial of authorization for him to file a new complaint and subsequent denial of authorization to file a Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1) motion requesting reconsideration of that denial. He argues that the district court erred when it denied him authorization to file the complaint because it had previously given him permission to do so in June 2024. Jaiyeola further argues that the district court erred when it denied him authorization to file the Rule 60(b)(1) motion because it did not explain its reasons for the denial.

Jaiyeola requests an order from this court directing the district court to either file his Rule 60(b)(1) motion or file his new complaint. But “we will grant a writ [of

¹ We upheld that order in *Jaiyeola v. Garmin Int’l, Inc.*, No. 22-3245, 2023 WL 4417480, at *2 (10th Cir. July 10, 2023).

mandamus] only when the district court has acted wholly without jurisdiction or so clearly abused its discretion as to constitute usurpation of power.” *In re Cooper Tire & Rubber Co.*, 568 F.3d 1180, 1186 (10th Cir. 2009) (internal quotation marks omitted). To obtain mandamus relief, Jaiyeola must demonstrate that “his right to the writ is clear and indisputable.” *Id.* at 1187 (internal quotation marks omitted). He has not done so.

Although Jaiyeola asserts that he received authorization in 2024 to file the same complaint the district court denied him authorization to file in 2025, he did not attach copies of either complaint to his mandamus petition.² He has therefore failed to show that the district court acted without jurisdiction, or clearly abused its discretion by denying him permission to file his 2025 complaint and his related Rule 60(b)(1) motion. Accordingly, we deny Jaiyeola’s petition for a writ of mandamus.

Entered for the Court

Per Curiam

² Jaiyeola submitted two emails with his mandamus petition that relate to permission to file complaints—one from 2024 and one from 2025. Both emails reference complaints that were attached as .pdf documents, but do not provide the actual .pdf complaint documents. He has therefore failed to show that the 2024 complaint that he was granted authorization to file is the same as the 2025 complaint that the court denied him authorization to file.