

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-2204

In Re: ANTHONY WILLIAMS,

Petitioner.

On Petitioner for Writ of Mandamus.
(3:07-cv-00422-GCM)

Submitted: December 17, 2009 Decided: December 28, 2009

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anthony Williams, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Williams petitions for a writ of mandamus seeking an order requiring the district court to hold an evidentiary hearing in his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) proceedings and to appoint counsel. We conclude that Williams is not entitled to mandamus relief.

Mandamus relief is available only when the petitioner has a clear right to the relief sought. In re First Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n, 860 F.2d 135, 138 (4th Cir. 1988). Further, mandamus is a drastic remedy and should only be used in extraordinary circumstances. Kerr v. United States Dist. Court, 426 U.S. 394, 402 (1976); In re Beard, 811 F.2d 818, 826 (4th Cir. 1987). Mandamus may not be used as a substitute for appeal. In re United Steelworkers, 595 F.2d 958, 960 (4th Cir. 1979).

The relief sought by Williams is not available by way of mandamus. Accordingly, we deny the petition for writ of mandamus. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED