In re: David L. Smith Appeal: 17-1497 Doc: 10 Filed: 07/31/2017 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

•		
	No. 17-1497	
In re: DAVID L. SMITH,		
Petitioner.		
	ition for Writ of Man No. 5:17-ct-03086-D	
Submitted: July 27, 2017		Decided: July 31, 2017
Before AGEE and FLOYD, Circui	t Judges, and HAMI	LTON, Senior Circuit Judge.
Petition denied by unpublished per	curiam opinion.	
David Lee Smith, Petitioner Pro Se	e.	

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

David Lee Smith petitions for a writ of mandamus seeking an order directing the district court to investigate the decisions of district court judges and a North Carolina clemency administrator in proceedings related to his state conviction. Smith also seeks an order reducing his state sentence to time served. We conclude that Smith is not entitled to mandamus 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). Mandamus may not be used as a substitute for appeal. *In re Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007). Further, 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), and does not have jurisdiction to review final state court orders, *Dist. of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 482 (1983).

The relief sought by Smith is not available by way of mandamus. Accordingly, although we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis, we deny the petition for writ of mandamus. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are

Appeal: 17-1497 Doc: 10 Filed: 07/31/2017 Pg: 3 of 3

adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED