

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-1149**

---

In Re: DAVID CONLEY,  
  
Petitioner.

---

**No. 14-1249**

---

In Re: DAVID CONLEY,  
  
Petitioner.

---

**No. 14-1374**

---

In Re: DAVID CONLEY,  
  
Petitioner.

---

**No. 14-1449**

---

In Re: DAVID CONLEY,  
  
Petitioner.

---

On Petitions for Writs of Mandamus.  
(5:13-ct-03251-F)

---

Submitted: June 26, 2014

Decided: July 1, 2014

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Petitions denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

David Conley, Petitioner Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

David Conley petitions for writs of mandamus seeking orders compelling the Department of Justice to investigate his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) claims, requiring a state official to rehear his claims of innocence, and directing the district court to serve his complaint, require defendants to file an answer, and find that his complaint states a claim. We conclude that Conley is not entitled to mandamus relief.

Mandamus relief is a drastic remedy and should be used only in extraordinary circumstances. Kerr v. U.S. 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). This court does not have jurisdiction to grant mandamus relief against state officials. Gurley v. Superior Court of Mecklenburg Cnty., 411 F.2d 586, 587 (4th Cir. 1969).

The relief sought by Conley is not available by way of mandamus. Accordingly, we deny the petitions for writs 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.

PETITIONS DENIED