

v. Holland, 346 U.S. 379, 384 (1953)). This petitioner addresses none of these elements, and thus fails to meet his burden. Furthermore, under the mandamus statute, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1361, petitioner cannot obtain relief as against private or non-federal entities. *See, e.g., Meadows v. Explorer Pipeline Co.*, Nos. 13–CV–568 and 13–CV–680, 2014 WL 1365039, at *7 (N.D. Okla. Apr. 7, 2014) (finding that, under § 1361, “a mandamus action does not lie against a private corporation”); *Banks v. Dusquesne Light Co.*, No. 2:13–cv–1350, 2013 WL 6070054, at *4 (W.D. Pa. Nov. 14, 2013) (finding that mandamus relief under § 1361 cannot be obtained against utility companies and their employees); *Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc. v. Drexel Chemical Co.*, 655 F. Supp. 2d 54, 62 (D.D.C. 2009) (concluding that 28 U.S.C. § 1361, does not confer subject matter jurisdiction in case where plaintiff sought to compel private, not federal, entities to act).

The petition for a writ of mandamus will be denied. An Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE:

24 July 2014


United States District Judge