

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-1700**

---

In Re: WILLIAM C. BOND,

Petitioner.

---

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus.  
(No. 1:14-cr-00186)

---

Submitted: October 30, 2015

Decided: November 5, 2015

---

Before WILKINSON, WYNN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William C. Bond, Petitioner Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William C. Bond petitions for a writ of mandamus, seeking an order from this court directing the district court to make its docket "whole" and properly captioned or titled, to produce an order terminating an attorney from criminal proceedings, and to unseal attorney termination matters. Bond also requests that this court "provide a framework for future district courts to determine how they should go about such matters, including a step-by-step procedure which would include separating [attorney] 'disqualification' matters from 'inquiry' matters." He further requests that this court remand matters to the district court for "further consideration" and adopt certain protocols governing "conflict of interest" and attorney "disqualification" hearings. We conclude that Bond is not entitled to mandamus relief.

Mandamus is a drastic remedy to 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). Mandamus relief is available only when there are no other means by which the relief sought could be granted, In re Beard, 811 F.2d 818, 826 (4th Cir. 1987), and may not be used as a substitute for appeal. In re Lockheed Martin Corp., 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007). The party seeking mandamus relief bears the heavy burden of showing that his

entitlement to relief is clear and indisputable. Allied Chem. Corp. v. Daiflon, Inc., 449 U.S. 33, 35 (1980).

We conclude after review of the mandamus petition that Bond has not established a clear and indisputable entitlement to the relief he seeks. Accordingly, although we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis, we deny the petition 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