

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-2449

In re: UBONG CHRISTOPHER UBOKUDOM; J.,

Petitioners.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. (3:25-cv-12972-SAL-PJG)

Submitted: February 26, 2026

Decided: March 2, 2026

Before NIEMEYER and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ubong Christopher Ubokudom, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ubong Christopher Ubokudom, on behalf of himself and his minor daughter, petitions for a writ of mandamus, alleging that the district court erred when it denied his motion to appoint counsel for his daughter and that it has not ruled on their pending motions for injunctive relief in *Ubokudom v. Target Corp.*, No. 3:25-cv-12972-SAL-PJG (D.S.C., filed Oct. 14, 2025). Petitioners seek an order directing the district court to appoint counsel and to grant various forms of injunctive relief in their pending civil action.

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). Mandamus may not be used as a substitute for appeal. *In re Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007).

The present record does not reveal undue delay in the district court. Moreover, Petitioners fail to show that they are otherwise entitled to mandamus relief. Accordingly, we deny Petitioners’ pending motions to expedite, to clarify, for leave to file digital media, for a stay of the district court proceedings, and for electronic service and protective treatment of email address, and 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