

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-1030

In re: DAVID LEE SMITH,

Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus. (No. 5:15-hc-02128-D)

Submitted: April 19, 2018

Decided: April 24, 2018

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and THACKER and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

David Lee Smith, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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 vacate its order denying relief on Smith's 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. He further seeks an order reducing his state sentence to time served and directing the state custodian to release him. 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). 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 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 and Smith's motion to amend his petition for mandamus, we deny the petition for writ of mandamus and Smith's motion to amend the district court judgment. 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