

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 23-1866**

---

In re: ARON J. FREELAND

Petitioner.

---

On Petition for a Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at Martinsburg. James P. Mazzone, Magistrate Judge. (3:23-cv-00063-JPB-JPM, 5:23-cv-00042-JPB-JPM)

---

Submitted: October 3, 2023

Decided: November 15, 2023

---

Before HEYTENS and BENJAMIN, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Aron J. Freeland, Petitioner Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Aron J. Freeland petitions for a writ of mandamus seeking an order directing the district court to conduct a status conference in his consolidated 28 U.S.C. § 2254 proceedings, through which Freeland challenges two state court judgments. We conclude that Freeland 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. Ct.*, 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 and “has no other adequate means to attain the relief [he] desires.” *In re Murphy-Brown*, 907 F.3d at 795 (alteration and internal quotation marks omitted).

In these proceedings, the magistrate judge issued a report recommending that the district court dismiss Freeland’s § 2254 petitions and deny his motions for a status conference. Freeland recently filed objections to the report and requested that the district court order his appearance at a hearing before it. Freeland’s conduct thus reflects that he has other means to attain the relief that he seeks, i.e., by pursuing his objections to the magistrate judge’s report. We are also satisfied that Freeland has not shown that he has a clear right to a status conference at this juncture. Accordingly, we deny the petition and amended petitions 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*