

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-1727

In re: ADRIENNE MALLARD,

Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus.

Submitted: September 9, 2021

Decided: September 13, 2021

Before MOTZ, KING, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Adrienne Mallard, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Adrienne Mallard petitions for a writ of mandamus seeking review of judgments entered in Virginia and Maryland state courts arising from cases relating to a work-related injury that Mallard sustained in 2014. We conclude that Mallard 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 [she] desires.” *Murphy-Brown*, 907 F.3d at 795 (alteration and internal quotation marks omitted). This court does not have jurisdiction to review state court orders. *See D.C. Ct. of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 482 (1983). Therefore, the relief sought by Mallard is not available by way of mandamus. Accordingly, we deny the petition for a 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