

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-1425

DEREK N. JARVIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ENTERPRISE FLEET SERVICES AND LEASING COMPANY,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 10-1573

DEREK N. JARVIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ENTERPRISE FLEET SERVICES AND LEASING COMPANY,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District
of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, Chief District
Judge. (8:07-cv-03385-DKC)

Submitted: December 17, 2010

Decided: January 20, 2011

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Derek N. Jarvis, Appellant Pro Se. Edward Lee Isler, Michelle Bodley Radcliffe, ISLER, DARE, RAY, RADCLIFFE & CONNOLLY, PC, Vienna, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Derek N. Jarvis appeals the district court's order dismissing his civil action and ruling on related matters, and the later order denying his motions to reconsider, for leave to appeal in forma pauperis, and for transcripts at government expense. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Jarvis v. Enterprise Fleet Services & Leasing Co., No. 8:07-cv-03385-DKC (D. Md. Mar. 17, 2010 & May 11, 2010).

We also deny Jarvis' petition for a writ of mandamus seeking to recuse the magistrate judge and district judge who ruled on his claims below. Mandamus relief is a drastic remedy and should be used only in extraordinary circumstances. Kerr v. U.S. Dist. Court, 426 U.S. 394, 402 (1976); United States v. Moussaoui, 333 F.3d 509, 516-17 (4th Cir. 2003). Further, 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). Jarvis has failed to establish the grounds needed for relief. See Shaw v. Martin, 733 F.2d 304, 308 (4th Cir. 1984) (providing grounds needed for recusal). 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.

AFFIRMED