

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1504

In re: KENT BELL,

Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. (1:21-cv-00107-GLR)

Submitted: July 20, 2023

Decided: July 25, 2023

Before NIEMEYER and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kent Bell, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kent Bell petitions for a writ of mandamus seeking relief from several alleged errors that occurred in his state criminal proceeding. We conclude that Bell 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). 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 Bell is not available by way of mandamus. 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