

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 17-1415

In re: LAWRENCE CRAWFORD; YAHYA MUQUIT, a/k/a Yahya Muquit;
ANTHONY COOK; ROBERT MITCHELL; DAVID DUREN; VINCENT
JERODE BEATON, a/k/a Vincent J. Beaton,

Petitioners.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus. (5:17-cv-00105-BHH; 8:16-cv-03909-RBH; 9:16-cv-03808-TLW-BM; 1:16-cv-03756-MBS; 1:16-cv-03853-RMG; 9:17-cv-00025-CMC-BM)

Submitted: August 24, 2017

Decided: August 28, 2017

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and SHEDD and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lawrence Crawford, Yahya Muquit, Anthony Cook, Robert Mitchell, David Duren,
Vincent Jerode Beaton, Petitioners Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Petitioners seek multiple forms of mandamus relief, including writs of mandamus against multiple federal judges and a state court judge. Petitioners also seek to proceed in forma pauperis and have filed a motion for change of venue. 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 federal 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 the named judges be ordered to recuse themselves from participation in their respective actions, Petitioners have not established extrajudicial 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 the motion for change of venue 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