

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 23-1713**

---

In re: JULIAN R. ASH,

Petitioner.

---

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. (1:22-cv-00649-GLR)

---

Submitted: August 24, 2023

Decided: August 28, 2023

---

Before QUATTLEBAUM and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and MOTZ, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Julian R. Ash, Petitioner Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Julian R. Ash petitions for a writ of mandamus, raising several challenges to the underlying district court proceedings. We conclude that Ash is not entitled to mandamus relief.

Mandamus relief is a drastic remedy and should be used only in extraordinary circumstances. *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 542 U.S. 367, 380 (2004); *In re Murphy-Brown, LLC*, 907 F.3d 788, 795 (4th Cir. 2018). Further, mandamus relief is available only when the petitioner has a clear right to the relief sought and “has no other adequate means to attain the relief [he] desires.” *Murphy-Brown*, 907 F.3d at 795 (alteration and internal quotation marks omitted). Mandamus may not be used as a substitute for appeal or, in this case, a rehearing petition. *See In re Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007).

Ash does not satisfy the standard for mandamus relief. Accordingly, we deny the petition for writ of mandamus. 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*