

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-1871

In Re: SEAN LAMONT DUDLEY, a/k/a John D. Brown,
Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus. (5:97-cr-00001-RLV)

Submitted: March 16, 2010

Decided: April 7, 2010

Before SHEDD, DUNCAN, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Sean Lamont Dudley, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Sean Lamont Dudley has petitioned this court for a writ of mandamus. In his petition, Dudley asks this court to: (i) order the district court to "adjudicate the matters currently stalled on its docket;" (ii) recall its mandate affirming the district court's judgment; or (iii) give sua sponte consideration to whether the district court had authority to accept his guilty plea under Fed. R. Crim. P. 11(b)(3) (requiring a district court to determine whether there is a factual basis for a guilty plea).

To obtain mandamus relief, a petitioner must show that:

(1) he has a clear and indisputable right to the relief sought; (2) the responding party has a clear duty to do the specific act requested; (3) the act requested is an official act or duty; (4) there are no other adequate means to attain the relief he desires; and (5) the issuance of the writ will effect right and justice in the circumstances.

In re Braxton, 258 F.3d 250, 261 (4th Cir. 2001) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). We have considered Dudley's petition and the district court docket sheet and find that the district court has recently disposed of Dudley's "stalled" motions. We further conclude that Dudley's remaining requests for relief do not meet the exacting requirements necessary for the issuance of a writ of mandamus. Accordingly, although we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis and grant

Dudley's motion to supplement his mandamus petition, we deny the mandamus petition. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED