UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

| • | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| | No. 17-6424 | |
| ROBERT HAUGHIE, | | |
| Petitioner - Appellant | , | |
| v. | | |
| STATE OF MARYLAND, | | |
| Respondent - Appelle | e. | |
| | | |
| Appeal from the United States Dis J. Frederick Motz, Senior District J | | · · |
| Submitted: July 20, 2017 | | Decided: July 25, 2017 |
| Before DUNCAN and WYNN, Cir | rcuit Judges, and HA | MILTON, Senior Circuit Judge. |
| Affirmed by unpublished per curia | m opinion. | |
| Robert D. Haughie, Appellant Pro | Se. | |
| Unpublished opinions are not bind | ing precedent in this | circuit. |

PER CURIAM:

Robert D. Haughie appeals the district court's order construing his petition for a writ of error coram nobis as a petition for a writ of mandamus and denying relief. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. A writ of error coram nobis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (2012) can be used to vacate a conviction when there is a fundamental error resulting in conviction and no other means of relief is available. United States v. Morgan, 346 U.S. 502, 509-11 (1954); United States v. Mandel, 862 F.2d 1067, 1074-75 (4th Cir. 1988). Haughie failed to establish the grounds needed to obtain relief under this writ. To the extent that Haughie sought mandamus relief, the district court correctly stated that the federal courts do 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 do not have jurisdiction to review final state court orders, Dist. of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462, 482 (1983). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. 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.

AFFIRMED