

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1680

In re: JUNIUS J. JOYNER, III,

Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. (1:25-cv-00306-PTG-LRV)

Submitted: September 25, 2025

Decided: September 29, 2025

Before GREGORY and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Junius J. Joyner, III, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Junius J. Joyner, III, petitions for a writ of mandamus, seeking an order directing the district court to act on his pending motion requesting the issuance of a new summons. We conclude that Joyner 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 (citation modified).

Joyner has not shown that he has no other means to attain the relief sought. And to the extent Joyner asserts that the district court has unduly delayed ruling on his motion, our review of the record does not reveal undue delay. 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