

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-1841

In Re: EDGAR SEARCY,

Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus.
(5:15-hc-02126-BO)

Submitted: September 29, 2015

Decided: October 1, 2015

Before WILKINSON, KING, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Edgar Searcy, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Edgar Searcy petitions for a writ of mandamus seeking to challenge civil commitments under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 1976 ("the Adam Walsh Act"), 18 U.S.C. §§ 4247-4248 (2012). We conclude that Searcy is not entitled to mandamus relief.

"Mandamus relief is a drastic remedy, to be invoked only in extraordinary circumstances." United States v. Moussaoui, 333 F.3d 509, 516-17 (4th Cir. 2003) (internal quotation marks omitted). Further, mandamus relief is available only when the petitioner has a clear right to the relief sought. In re Braxton, 258 F.3d 250, 261 (4th Cir. 2001). Mandamus "may not be used as a substitute for appeal." In re Lockheed Martin Corp., 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007).

The relief sought by Searcy is not available by way of mandamus. Accordingly, although we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis, we deny the petition for writ of mandamus. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED