

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-1330

In re: WILLIAM C. PUMPHREY,

Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus. (5:15-cv-14430)

Submitted: July 9, 2019

Decided: July 17, 2019

Before KING, AGEE, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William C. Pumphrey, Petitioner Pro Se. Matthew Charles Lindsey, OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charleston, West Virginia, for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William C. Pumphrey petitions for a writ of mandamus in his civil case, asking this court to order the district court not to proceed further in the case without considering his untimely filed objections. “[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 after final judgment. *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 Pumphrey fails to show that he is entitled to mandamus relief. Accordingly, we deny the petition for writ of mandamus. We grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis. 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