

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 25-2019**

---

In re: GRAHAM HARRY SCHIFF,

Petitioner.

---

On Petition for Extraordinary Writ.

---

Submitted: October 30, 2025

Decided: November 4, 2025

---

Before RUSHING and BENJAMIN, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, 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Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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—who currently is serving a Maryland state probationary sentence—petitions this court pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 21 for an extraordinary writ, seeking an order declaring unconstitutional and enjoining enforcement of Exec. Order No. 14,341, 90 Fed. Reg. 42127-28 (Aug. 25, 2025).

This court’s authority to issue extraordinary writs pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 21 is governed by the All Writs Act (the Act), 28 U.S.C. § 1651. Under the Act, federal courts “may issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law.” 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a). The Act “is a residual source of authority to issue writs that are not otherwise covered by statute.” *Carlisle v. United States*, 517 U.S. 416, 429 (1996) (internal quotation marks omitted). Thus, probationers may not resort to the Act, or to the common law writs it authorizes, when another remedy is available. *See, e.g., United States v. Swaby*, 855 F.3d 233, 238 (4th Cir. 2017) (“A writ of *coram nobis* is an exceptional remedy that may be granted only when a fundamental error has occurred and no other available remedy exists.”); *United States v. Torres*, 282 F.3d 1241, 1245 (10th Cir. 2002) (recognizing that writ of *audita querela* is unavailable if other remedies are available to petitioner). Because another remedy is available to Schiff, he fails to satisfy the requirements for relief under the Act. We therefore deny his petition for an extraordinary writ. 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*