

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 20-1755**

---

In re: PERCY JAMES TUCKER,

Petitioner.

---

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus. (2:09-cr-00182-AWA-DEM-1)

---

Submitted: November 18, 2020

Decided: December 7, 2020

---

Before MOTZ, KEENAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Percy James Tucker, Petitioner Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Percy James Tucker petitions for a writ of mandamus in his closed criminal case. He seeks an order directing a full investigation of the case. “[M]andamus is a drastic remedy that must be reserved for extraordinary situations.” *In re Murphy-Brown, LLC*, 907 F.3d 788, 795 (4th Cir. 2018) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). “Courts provide mandamus relief only when (1) petitioner ‘ha[s] no other adequate means to attain the relief [he] desires’; (2) petitioner has shown a ‘clear and indisputable’ right to the requested relief; and (3) the court deems the writ ‘appropriate under the circumstances.’” *Id.* (quoting *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court*, 542 U.S. 367, 380-81 (2004)). The writ of mandamus is not a substitute for appeal after final judgment. *Will v. United States*, 389 U.S. 90, 97 (1967); *In re Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007).

We have reviewed Tucker’s petition and conclude that he fails to show he is entitled to the requested relief. 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*