

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 18-2263**

---

In re: PRIEST MOMOLU V.S. SIRLEAF, JR.,

Petitioner.

---

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus. (3:18-cv-00311-MHL-RCY)

---

Submitted: April 10, 2019

Decided: April 30, 2019

---

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, NIEMEYER, Circuit Judge, and SHEDD, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Momolu V.S. Sirleaf, Petitioner Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Momolu V.S. Sirleaf petitions for a writ of mandamus, alleging the district court has not filed certain motions in his case. He seeks an order from this court directing the district court to file the motions. “[M]andamus is a drastic remedy that must be reserved for extraordinary situations.” *In re Murphy-Brown, LLC*, 907 F.3d 788, 795 (4th Cir. 2018) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). “Courts provide mandamus relief only when (1) petitioner ‘ha[s] no other adequate means to attain the relief [he] desires’; (2) petitioner has shown a ‘clear and indisputable’ right to the requested relief; and (3) the court deems the writ ‘appropriate under the circumstances.’” *Id.* (quoting *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court*, 542 U.S. 367, 380-81 (2004)). The writ of mandamus is not a substitute for appeal. *Will v. United States*, 389 U.S. 90, 97 (1967); *In re Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007). We have reviewed the district court’s docket and conclude that Sirleaf fails to show that he is entitled to mandamus relief. Accordingly, we deny his petition for a writ of mandamus. 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*