In re: Shaheen Cabbagestalk Appeal: 15-1818 Doc: 23 Filed: 12/21/2015 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 405759017

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-1818

In re: SHAHEEN CABBAGESTALK,

Petitioner.

No. 15-1883

In re: SHAHEEN CABBAGESTALK,

Petitioner.

On Petitions for Writ of Mandamus. (No. 5:14-cv-03771-RMG)

Submitted: December 17, 2015 Decided: December 21, 2015

Before DIAZ and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petitions denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Shaheen Cabbagestalk, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Shaheen Cabbagestalk petitions for a writ of mandamus seeking an order directing his immediate release from custody after a state conviction for armed robbery. We conclude that Cabbagestalk 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). Mandamus may not be used as a substitute for appeal. In re Lockheed Martin Corp., 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007). Further, this court does not have jurisdiction to grant mandamus relief against state officials, Gurley v. Superior Court of Mecklenburg Cty., 411 F.2d 586, 587 (4th Cir. 1969), and does not have jurisdiction to review final state court orders, Dist. of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462, 482 (1983).

The relief sought by Cabbagestalk is not available by way of mandamus. Accordingly, although we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis, we deny the petitions and amended petition for writ of mandamus. We deny all of Cabbagestalk's pending motions. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and

Appeal: 15-1818 Doc: 23 Filed: 12/21/2015 Pg: 3 of 3

legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITIONS DENIED