

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-1498**

---

In Re: BEVERLY L. HENNAGER,

Petitioner.

---

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus.  
(1:15-cv-00149-LO-TCB)

---

Submitted: May 9, 2017

Decided: May 30, 2017

---

Before AGEE, KEENAN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Beverly L. Hennager, Petitioner Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Beverly L. Hennager has filed a petition for a writ of mandamus in which she asks this court to order the district court to disburse to her earnings derived from the sale of certain property, and to have voided various district court orders with which she disagrees. We conclude that Hennager 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). Mandamus may not be used as a substitute for appeal, however. *In re Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007). 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).

It is clear that Hennager is using mandamus as a substitute for appeal and, in any event, she has not established a clear right to the relief sought. Accordingly, we deny the petition for writ of mandamus and deny as moot her motion to expedite. 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*