

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-2382**

---

In re: DANIEL JOHNSON WILLIS

Petitioner.

---

**No. 15-2462**

---

In re: DANIEL JOHNSON WILLIS

Petitioner.

---

**No. 15-2518**

---

In re: DANIEL JOHNSON WILLIS

Petitioner.

---

**No. 16-1130**

---

In re: DANIEL JOHNSON WILLIS,

Petitioner.

---

On Petition for Writs of Mandamus and Extraordinary Writ  
(No. 4:15-mc-00004-H; 4:15-MC-00001-H; 4:15-mc-00002-H; 4:15-mc-  
00003-H; 4:15-mc-00004-H; 4:06-cv-00143-F; 4:96-cv-00006-H;  
4:96-cv-00089-H)

---

Submitted: March 29, 2016

Decided: March 31, 2016

---

Before GREGORY and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Petitions denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Daniel Johnson Willis, Petitioner Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Daniel Johnson Willis petitions for a writ of mandamus and extraordinary writ seeking an order invalidating the preliminary filing injunctions entered against him in this court and the district court. We conclude that Willis is not entitled to 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). We have carefully reviewed Willis's petitions for relief and find them to be without merit. Further, mandamus may not be used as a substitute for appeal. In re Lockheed Martin Corp., 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007). And, 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).

The relief sought by Willis is not available by way of mandamus or extraordinary writ. Accordingly, although we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis and Willis's motion to supplement titled as a "motion to amend," we deny the petitions.

We deny Willis's motion for oral argument and all other remaining pending motions filed by Willis. 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