## UNPUBLISHED

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

| <u>-</u>   |  |                              |
|--|--|------------------------------|
| <u>-</u>   | No. 17-1694                                |                              |
| In Re: SHAPAT AHDAWAN NABAYA, a/k/a Norman Abbott, |  |                              |
| Petitioner.  |  |                              |
| _  |  |                              |
|  | tion for Extraordinar<br>:17-cr-00003-MHL- | · ·                          |
| Submitted: June 23, 2017                           |  | Decided: July 14, 2017       |
| Before WILKINSON and SHEDI Judge.                  | D, Circuit Judges,                         | and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit |
| Petition denied by unpublished per                 | curiam opinion.                            |                              |
| Shapat Ahdawan Nabaya, Petitione                   | er Pro Se.                                 |                              |
| Unpublished opinions are not bindi                 | ng precedent in this                       | circuit.                     |

## PER CURIAM:

Shapat Ahdawan Nabaya petitions for a writ of quo warranto challenging the district court's authority over criminal charges against him. He also filed several motions seeking to enjoin the district court's proceedings. We conclude that Nabaya is not entitled to quo warranto or injunctive relief.

A private individual lacks standing to institute a quo warranto proceeding. Newman v. United States ex rel. Frizzell, 238 U.S. 537, 545-46 (1915). Thus, Nabaya's petition must be denied. We deny as moot Nabaya's motion to stay the district court proceedings pending resolution of this petition.

Nabaya has also filed motions challenging the jurisdiction of the district court and seeking an order from this court enjoining or dismissing the district court proceeding. Nabaya has failed to demonstrate any extraordinary circumstances warranting such relief. We therefore deny his motions for injunctive relief.

Accordingly, although we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis, we deny the petition for writ of quo warranto and deny Nabaya's motions for a stay and for injunctive relief. 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