

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-1936**

---

In re: THOMAS EUGENE LANGSTON,

Petitioner.

---

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus.  
(1:13-cv-00780-CMH-IDD)

---

Submitted: November 19, 2013

Decided: November 21, 2013

---

Before WYNN and FLOYD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Thomas Eugene Langston, Petitioner Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Thomas Eugene Langston petitions for a writ of mandamus, seeking an order directing the district court to treat his previously filed successive 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition as Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(4) motion. We conclude that Langston is not entitled to mandamus relief.

Mandamus relief is a drastic remedy and should be used only in extraordinary circumstances. Kerr v. United States Dist. Court, 426 U.S. 394, 402 (1976); United States v. Moussaoui, 333 F.3d 509, 516-17 (4th Cir. 2003). Further, 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).

Mandamus may not be used as a substitute for appeal. In re Lockheed Martin Corp., 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007). The relief sought by Langston is not available by way of mandamus. Accordingly, although we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED