

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-1136

In re: TIMOTHY OMAR HANKINS, SR.,

Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus.

Submitted: May 21, 2020

Decided: May 27, 2020

Before AGEE and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Timothy Omar Hankins, Sr., Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Timothy Omar Hankins, Sr., petitions for a writ of mandamus seeking an order requiring the investigation of his claims and any other available relief. We conclude that Hankins is not entitled to mandamus relief.

Mandamus relief is a drastic remedy and should be used only in extraordinary circumstances. *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court*, 542 U.S. 367, 380 (2004); *In re Murphy-Brown, LLC*, 907 F.3d 788, 795 (4th Cir. 2018). Further, mandamus relief is available only when the petitioner has a clear right to the relief sought. *Murphy-Brown*, 907 F.3d at 795. Moreover, mandamus may not be used as a substitute for appeal. *In re Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007). Finally, this court does 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 does not have jurisdiction to review final state court orders, *D.C. Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 482 (1983).

The relief Hankins seeks is not available by way of mandamus. Accordingly, although we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis, we deny the petition for 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