

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-4584**

---

In re: JUAN SANCHEZ HYMAN, a/k/a John Boy,  
Petitioner.

---

**No. 15-2437**

---

In re: JUAN SANCHEZ HYMAN, a/k/a John Boy,  
Petitioner.

---

On Petitions for Writ of Mandamus  
(Nos. 5:13-cr-00312-H-1; 5:13-cr-00312-H-1)

---

Submitted: January 19, 2016                      Decided: February 17, 2016

---

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

---

Petitions denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Juan Sanchez Hyman, Petitioner Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated proceedings, Juan Sanchez Hyman petitions for writs of mandamus seeking an order directing the district court to rule on his motion for a speedy trial. We conclude that Hyman is not entitled to the requested relief.

"Mandamus is a drastic remedy to be invoked only in extraordinary situations." United States v. Moussaoui, 333 F.3d 509, 516 (4th Cir. 2003) (internal quotation marks omitted). The Supreme Court has specified two conditions "that must be satisfied as a predicate to mandamus jurisdiction": (1) "'the party seeking issuance of the writ must have no other adequate means to attain the relief he desires,'" id. at 517 (quoting Kerr v. U.S. Dist. Ct., 426 U.S. 394, 403 (1976)), and (2) "'his right to issuance of the writ [must be] clear and indisputable,'" id. (quoting Bankers Life & Cas. Co. v. Holland, 346 U.S. 379, 384 (1953)).

We have reviewed the record and find that Hyman has not made the requisite showing. His speedy trial claims, under either the Sixth Amendment or the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161-3174 (2012), do not demonstrate a clear and indisputable right to relief. Accordingly, although we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis in No. 15-2437, 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