

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1348

In re: GRAHAM HARRY SCHIFF,

Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. (8:20-cv-01144-PX)

Submitted: April 24, 2025

Decided: April 28, 2025

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

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Graham Harry Schiff, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Graham Harry Schiff petitions for a writ of mandamus seeking an order directing the district court to docket Schiff’s Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(4) motion and directing the recusal of all the judges in the District of Maryland. We conclude that Schiff 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 (brackets and internal quotation marks omitted). Our review of the record leads us to conclude that Schiff does not have a clear right to the relief he seeks. *See, e.g., In re Strickland*, 87 F.4th 257, 261 (4th Cir. 2023) (denying mandamus relief when requested order “would invade the broad discretion that is given to the district court to manage its docket” (brackets and internal quotation marks omitted)).

Accordingly, we deny the petition for writ of mandamus. We deny Schiff’s motion for initial hearing en banc, and we deny as moot his motion to expedite. 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