UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-1454

In re: OLANDER R. BYNUM,

Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus. (5:97-hc-00495-H)

Submitted: June 11, 2020   Decided: June 25, 2020

Before NIEMEYER and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Olander R. Bynum, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Olander R. Bynum petitions for a writ of mandamus, seeking an order from this court directing the district court to vacate its final order in his 1997 habeas corpus action and to liberally construe the federal petition in that action as an emergency motion to reduce his sentence to time served and to order his custodian to release him from prison due to the COVID-19 pandemic. We conclude that Bynum is not entitled to mandamus relief.

Mandamus relief is a drastic remedy and should be used only in extraordinary circumstances. *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court*, 542 U.S. 367, 380 (2004); *In re Murphy-Brown, LLC*, 907 F.3d 788, 795 (4th Cir. 2018). Further, mandamus relief is available only when the petitioner has a clear right to the relief sought. *Murphy-Brown*, 907 F.3d at 795. Mandamus may not be used as a substitute for appeal. *In re Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007). This court also does not have jurisdiction to grant mandamus relief against state officials, *Gurley v. Superior Court of Mecklenburg Cty.*, 411 F.2d 586, 587 (4th Cir. 1969) (per curiam), and does not have jurisdiction to review final state court orders, *D.C. Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 482 (1983).

The relief sought by Bynum is not available by way of mandamus. Accordingly, we deny the petition for a 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