

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1984

In re: TOMMY SEVILLA, individually and as next friends of their minor children, L.S., G.S., and I.B.; MELODIE SEVILLA, individually and as next friends of their minor children, L.S., G.S., and I.B.,

Petitioners.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. (3:25-cv-03528-JDA-SVH)

Submitted: October 28, 2025

Decided: November 14, 2025

Before GREGORY and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Tommy Sevilla, Melodie Sevilla, Petitioners Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tommy Sevilla and Melodie Sevilla petition for a writ of mandamus, asking this court to order the district court to rule on their pending motions and take other actions in their civil action. The district court stayed the underlying action pending a decision by this court on their interlocutory appeal. “[M]andamus is a drastic remedy that must be reserved for extraordinary situations.” *In re Murphy-Brown, LLC*, 907 F.3d 788, 795 (4th Cir. 2018) (internal quotation marks omitted). “Courts provide mandamus relief only when (1) petitioner ‘ha[s] no other adequate means to attain the relief [he] desires’; (2) petitioner has shown a ‘clear and indisputable’ right to the requested relief; and (3) the court deems the writ ‘appropriate under the circumstances.’” *Id.* (quoting *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 542 U.S. 367, 380-81 (2004)); *In re Moore*, 955 F.3d 384, 388 (4th Cir. 2020). The writ of mandamus is not a substitute for appeal after final judgment. *Will v. United States*, 389 U.S. 90, 97 (1967); *In re Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007).

We have reviewed the mandamus petition and the supplements, and we conclude that Petitioners fail to show that they are entitled to mandamus relief. Accordingly, we deny the petition. We also deny the pending motions.* 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

* We deny the motion to stay as moot. We deny the motion to seal without prejudice to any motion that Petitioners may file in the district court. *See* 4th Cir. R. 25(c)(2).