

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-1500

In re: WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Petitioner.

No. 21-1502

In re: WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Petitioner.

No. 21-1503

In re: WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Petitioner.

No. 21-1530

In re: WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Petitioner.

No. 21-1534

In re: WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Petitioner.

No. 21-1547

In re: WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Petitioner.

No. 21-1618

In re: WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Petitioner.

No. 21-1796

In re: WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Petitioner.

No. 21-1798

In re: WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Petitioner.

No. 21-1799

In re: WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Petitioner.

No. 21-1808

In re: WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Petitioner.

No. 21-1813

In re: WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Petitioner.

No. 21-1816

In re: WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Petitioner.

No. 21-1817

In re: WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Petitioner.

On Petitions for Writ of Mandamus. (5:14-cr-00240-BR-1)

Submitted: September 14, 2021

Decided: September 17, 2021

Before THACKER and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petitions denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William Scott Davis, Jr., Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Scott Davis, Jr., has filed 14 petitions for a writ of mandamus, raising a litany of claims concerning his prior federal and state convictions and a prefiling injunction entered by this court that applies to Davis' civil cases. We conclude that Davis 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. *In re Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007). This court does not have jurisdiction to grant mandamus relief against state officials, *Gurley v. Superior Ct. of Mecklenburg Cnty.*, 411 F.2d 586, 587 (4th Cir. 1969), and does not have jurisdiction to review final state court orders, *D.C. Ct. of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 482 (1983).

The relief sought by Davis is not available by way of mandamus. Accordingly, we deny the petitions 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.

PETITIONS DENIED