

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-1379**

---

In Re: WILLIAM C. BOND,  
  
Petitioner.

---

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus.  
(1:07-cv-01188-WDQ)

---

Submitted: May 2, 2008

Decided: June 2, 2008

---

Before NIEMEYER and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges, and WILKINS, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William C. Bond, Petitioner Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William C. Bond petitions this court for a writ of mandamus, seeking an order directing the district court and the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Maryland to produce materials and conduct a further search of their records pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), 5 U.S.C.A. § 552 (West 2007). Bond has filed additional motions in this case, including a motion to permit him to file a petition that exceeds the applicable page limits, a motion to file a reply brief, a motion to recuse any Maryland judges from the panel hearing this matter, and motions to stay consideration of case No. 08-1320 until his petition for writ of mandamus had been ruled upon. We conclude Bond is not entitled to relief.

Mandamus relief is available only when the petitioner has a clear right to the relief sought. In re First Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n, 860 F.2d 135, 138 (4th Cir. 1988). Further, mandamus is a drastic remedy and should be used only in extraordinary circumstances. Kerr v. United States Dist. Court, 426 U.S. 394, 402 (1976); In re Beard, 811 F.2d 818, 826 (4th Cir. 1987). Mandamus may not be used as a substitute for appeal. In re United Steelworkers, 595 F.2d 958, 960 (4th Cir. 1979).

Bond has failed to demonstrate that he has no other available means of relief. Because Bond has appealed from the district court's dismissal of his FOIA action and may obtain any

relief to which he may be entitled through his direct appeal, mandamus relief is not available. See In re Braxton, 258 F.3d 250, 261 (4th Cir. 2001). Therefore, while we grant Bond's motion to exceed the applicable page limit on his petition and his motion to file a reply brief, we deny his petition for writ of mandamus. Furthermore, we deny Bond's motion for recusal and his motions to consolidate and stay the appeal in case No. 08-1320. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED