

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-2141

In re: ANTHONY COOK; DAVID DUREN; YAHYA MUQUIT; LAWRENCE
CRAWFORD,

Petitioners.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus. (4:16-cv-02939-MBS-TER)

Submitted: February 16, 2017

Decided: February 21, 2017

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, DUNCAN, Circuit Judge, and
HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

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

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Petitioners seek several forms of mandamus relief, including writs of mandamus against multiple federal judges. Petitioners also seek to proceed in forma pauperis and have filed motions for a ruling of law, for recusal, and for this court to reconsider its previous orders in this and related appeals.

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, or this court's prior orders, 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 district court judges or judges of this court be ordered to recuse themselves from participation in their respective actions or appeals,

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, we deny mandamus relief and Petitioners' other pending motions. 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