

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1953

In re: YAHYA MUQUIT, a/k/a Yahya Muqit; DAVID DUREN;
ANTHONY COOK; LAWRENCE CRAWFORD, a/k/a Jonah Gabriel, a/k/a
Jahjah T. Tishbite,

Petitioners.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus. (8:14-cv-03555-RBH; 0:16-cv-
00992-TMC-PJG)

Submitted: November 22, 2016 Decided: November 29, 2016

Before DIAZ and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Yahya Muquit, David Duren, Anthony Cook, Lawrence Crawford,
Petitioners Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Petitioners seek several forms of mandamus relief, including a writ of mandamus against United States District Court Judge R. Bryan Harwell. Petitioners have also filed motions to supplement their mandamus petition and for ruling of law and recusal, as well as applications to proceed in forma pauperis.

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 reviewed Petitioners' filings and conclude that Petitioners have not established that extraordinary circumstances exist warranting mandamus relief. To the extent Petitioners challenge the district court's rulings in their respective district court actions, mandamus may not be used as a substitute for appeal. In re Lockheed Martin Corp., 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007). And to the extent Petitioners ask that Judge Harwell be ordered to recuse himself from their respective district court actions, Petitioners have not

established extra-judicial bias. See In re Beard, 811 F.2d 818, 826-27 (4th Cir. 1987).

Accordingly, although we grant Petitioners' applications to proceed in forma pauperis and their motion to supplement their mandamus petition, we deny the motion for ruling of law and recusal, and deny mandamus relief. 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