

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-2478

In re: MELDAMION ANTOINE HUGULEY,

Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. (1:18-cr-00205-WO-1)

Submitted: March 12, 2026

Decided: March 17, 2026

Before WILKINSON and KING, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Meldamion Antoine Huguley, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Meldamion Antoine Huguley petitions for a writ of mandamus seeking an order vacating his 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) conviction, which he contends violates the Second and Fourteenth Amendments. We conclude that Huguley 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). Mandamus may not be used as a substitute for appeal. *In re Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007).

The relief sought by Huguley is not available by way of mandamus. Furthermore, to the extent that Huguley also suggests that the district court has unduly delayed ruling on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion that challenges the validity of the same conviction, our review of the district court’s docket reveals that the court recently dismissed Huguley’s motion as unauthorized and successive. 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