UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 26-2077

In re: DENNIS MICHAEL PHILIPSON,

Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. (1:25-mc-00012-MSN-WEF)

Submitted: August 25, 2026 Decided: August 31, 2026

Before KING and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Dennis Michael Philipson, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dennis Michael Philipson petitions for a writ of mandamus seeking an order vacating several orders and directing the district court to preserve the docket and permit him to file additional documents in a closed case. We conclude that Philipson 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 (citation modified). And mandamus "may not be used as a substitute for appeal." *In re Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007).

We recently vacated one of the orders at which this petition was directed. Accordingly, to the extent Philipson seeks relief from the garnishment order, this petition is moot. And upon review, we conclude that Philipson has alternative means to obtain the remaining relief he seeks and that issuance of the writ would not be "appropriate under the circumstances." *In re Moore*, 955 F.3d 384, 388 (4th Cir. 2020) (internal quotation marks omitted).

[*] Philipson has moved for leave to file an amended mandamus petition and for leave to file supporting documentation; we grant those motions. He has also filed motions to expedite and for a stay; we deny those motions as moot. We deny all other pending motions.

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