

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 20-1795**

---

In re: WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Petitioner.

---

**No. 20-1799**

---

In re: WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Petitioner.

---

On Petitions for Writ of Mandamus. (5:14-cr-00240-BR-1)

---

Submitted: November 19, 2020

Decided: November 13, 2020

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

---

Petitions denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William Scott Davis, Jr., Petitioner Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Scott Davis, Jr. filed two petitions for a writ of mandamus that: (1) raise several claims challenging his conviction and sentence; (2) seek the recusal of the district court judge; and (3) challenge the district court's orders, entered in 2017 and 2018 in Davis' criminal case, instructing the district court clerk not to docket his pro se filings. We conclude that Davis 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. Ct.*, 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. Mandamus may also not be used as a substitute for appeal. *In re Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007).

The relief sought by Davis is either not available by way of mandamus or not warranted because he has not demonstrated that he is entitled to relief. Accordingly, we deny the petitions 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.

*PETITIONS DENIED*