FILED
United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

January 27, 2026

Christopher M. Wolpert
Clerk of Court

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

In re: KEATON GUNNELS, Petitioner.	No. 25-2151 (D.C. No. 1:19-CR-00594-MV-1) (D. N.M.)

ORDER

Before **HOLMES**, Chief Judge, **CARSON** and **FEDERICO**, Circuit Judges.

This matter is before the court on a petition for a writ of mandamus. Keaton Gunnels takes issue with the district court's October 9, 2025, post-judgment order denying miscellaneous post-judgment motions.[1] Gunnels seeks an order from this court directing the district court to: (1) vacate the filing restrictions imposed against him; (2) remove the "sovereign citizen" characterization from his filings; and (3) comply with constitutional and procedural rules.

"[A] writ of mandamus is a drastic remedy, and is to be invoked only in extraordinary circumstances." *In re Cooper Tire & Rubber Co.*, 568 F.3d 1180, 1186 (10th Cir. 2009) (internal quotation marks omitted). "[W]e will grant a writ only when the district court has acted wholly without jurisdiction or so clearly abused its discretion as to constitute usurpation of power." *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted). Gunnels

[1] The district court entered judgment on revocation of supervised release on March 24, 2025.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

must meet three conditions to obtain a writ of mandamus: (1) he "must have no other adequate means to attain the relief he desires"; (2) he "must demonstrate that his right to the writ is clear and indisputable"; and (3) "the issuing court, in the exercise of its discretion, must be satisfied that the writ is appropriate under the circumstances." *Id.* at 1187 (internal quotation marks omitted).

Gunnels has not established his right to this extraordinary relief. "[A] writ is not a substitute for an appeal" and "[i]t is not appropriate to issue a writ when the most that could be claimed is that the district courts have erred in ruling on matters within their jurisdiction." *Id.* at 1186–87 (internal quotation marks omitted). Gunnels's challenges to the district court's order should have been brought on appeal. *See In re Weston*, 18 F.3d 860, 864 (10th Cir. 1994) ("a writ of mandamus . . . is not a vehicle to relieve persons of the consequences of their previous decision not to pursue available procedures and remedies"). And his assertion that he could not file an appeal because the district court imposed filing restrictions against him is belied by the text of the October 2025 order itself, which, in imposing filing restrictions upon Gunnels, twice stated that he was permitted to file "objections to this order" or "a notice of appeal." Order at 3, 5.

Further, Gunnels has not established that he has a clear and indisputable right to prohibit the district court from determining that his filings raised sovereign citizen arguments, nor that mandamus relief is the appropriate avenue to bring his legal challenges to the district court's order. He is therefore not entitled to extraordinary relief in the form of mandamus.

Accordingly, we DENY his petition for a writ of mandamus.

Entered for the Court

Per Curiam