

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-1852

In re: SEQUOIA MCKINNON; RON SANTA MCCRAY; LAWRENCE
CRAWFORD,

Petitioners.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus.
(8:22-cv-01205-RMG; 1:22-cv-01204-TLW-SVH; 9:21-cv-02526-TLW)

Submitted: November 17, 2022

Decided: November 22, 2022

Before KING, QUATTLEBAUM and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Sequoia McKinnon, Ron Santa McCray, and Lawrence Crawford, Petitioners Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Petitioners seek several forms of mandamus relief, including a writ of mandamus against United States Senior District Judge Terry L. Wooten and United States District Judge Richard M. Gergel. Petitioners have also filed a motion to supplement, which, in relevant part, seeks an order directing Judge Gergel to allow the filing of certain documents.

Mandamus relief is a drastic remedy and should be used only in extraordinary circumstances. *Kerr v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 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).

Upon review of the relevant filings, we conclude that Petitioners have not established that extraordinary circumstances exist warranting mandamus relief. Moreover, to the extent Petitioners challenge the district court's rulings in their respective district court actions, mandamus may not be used as a substitute for appeal. *In re Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007). Finally, to the extent Petitioners ask that the district court judges recuse themselves from their respective district court actions, Petitioners have not established extra-judicial bias. *See In re Beard*, 811 F.2d 818, 826-27 (4th Cir. 1987).

Accordingly, we deny the motion to supplement and deny mandamus relief. 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