

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-1714

In re: TENNYSON HARRIS, a/k/a Teddy, a/k/a Mark T.,

Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus. (8:00-cr-00253-PJM-3)

Submitted: July 26, 2022

Decided: July 29, 2022

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Tennyson Harris, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tennyson Harris petitions for a writ of mandamus, asking us to order the district court to take certain actions in his closed criminal case. “[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 Harris’ petition and conclude that he fails to show that he is entitled to mandamus relief. Accordingly, we deny the petition. 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