

Filed: November 5, 1998

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 98-1204  
(CR-96-66)

---

In Re: MICHAEL ANTONIO ADDISON,

Petitioner.

---

O R D E R

---

The court amends its opinion filed May 1, 1998, as follows:

On page 2, first full paragraph, line 4 -- the words "pled guilty to" are corrected to read "was convicted of."

On page 2, second full paragraph, line 1 -- the words "guilty plea" are corrected to read "convictions."

For the Court - By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor  
Clerk

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 98-1204**

---

In Re: MICHAEL ANTONIO ADDISON,

Petitioner.

---

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus.

---

Submitted: April 16, 1998

Decided: May 1, 1998

---

Before WILKINS and HAMILTON, Circuit Judges, and PHILLIPS, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael Antonio Addison, Petitioner Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Michael Antonio Addison has filed a petition for a writ of mandamus from this court seeking an order staying the South Carolina state court from proceeding against him in a criminal case. Subsequent to the filing of this petition, Addison was convicted of the criminal charges and is now in state custody serving his sentence. Addison has now filed a motion for release, alleging that he is being held against his will and denied legal materials.

Because Addison's convictions rendered his petition moot, we deny his mandamus petition and his motion for release. To the extent Addison's motion for release can be construed as another mandamus petition challenging the validity of his conviction, we deny this petition, because Addison has not shown that he has "no other adequate means to attain the relief he desires" or that his entitlement to such relief is "clear and indisputable." See Allied Chem. Corp. v. Daiflon, Inc., 449 U.S. 33, 35 (1980). We also deny Appellant's motion for an injunction. 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