

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-7059

In Re: OKANG KAREEM ROCHELLE,

Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus.
(5:07-hc-02014-BR)

Submitted: August 3, 2007

Decided: August 14, 2007

Before MICHAEL and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and WILKINS, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Okang Kareem Rochelle, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Okang Kareem Rochelle, a federal inmate, petitions this court for a writ of mandamus. Rochelle's petition challenges a February 15, 2007 order from the Eastern District of North Carolina. That order denied a pro se motion filed by Rochelle in which he (1) requested that his August 6, 2007 civil commitment hearing be held, not by video conference, but in open court; (2) requested copies of the discovery motion in his underlying criminal case; (3) requested the Public Defenders' Office to be removed from his case; (4) challenged the adequacy of his evaluations at the Federal Medical Center at Butner, North Carolina; and (5) requested that he be released from the Federal Medical Center so that he could acquire resources to hire private counsel and mount his defense.

Rochelle's mandamus petition reasserts claims raised in his pro se motion. With respect to his request to be released from Butner Medical Center, Rochelle fails to demonstrate a clear entitlement to a writ of mandamus on this request. See In re First Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n, 860 F.2d 135, 138 (4th Cir. 1988). Finally, Rochelle's remaining claims are not cognizable in a petition for writ of mandamus. Accordingly, although we grant Rochelle's motion to proceed in forma pauperis, we deny his petition for writ of mandamus. We also deny Rochelle's motion to stay the civil commitment hearing. In light of this disposition,

Rochelle's motion to expedite is denied as moot. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and oral argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED