

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 26-1464

In re: KRISTIN ANN TKACH-PELGRIM,

Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the District of Maryland at Baltimore. (1:25-cr-00282-BAH-1)

Submitted: July 16, 2026

Decided: July 21, 2026

Before WILKINSON, RICHARDSON, and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kristin Ann Tkach-Pelgrim, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kristin Tkach-Pelgrim petitions for a writ of mandamus seeking an order directing the district court to (1) conduct a detention review hearing and release her on her own recognizance, (2) enforce its competency order and facilitate her transfer for a competency evaluation or dismiss the competency proceedings, and (3) conduct a *Faretta* hearing to determine if she is competent to stand trial and represent herself. She also seeks an order finding her pretrial detention unlawful under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. We conclude that Tkach-Pelgrim 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 [she] desires.” *Murphy-Brown*, 907 F.3d at 795 (alteration and internal quotation marks omitted).

Mandamus may not be used as a substitute for appeal. *In re Lockheed Martin Corp.*, 503 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2007). Here, the district court denied Tkach-Pelgrim’s petition for habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and her request for immediate release, and she did not appeal. Moreover, Tkach-Pelgrim’s competency evaluation has now been completed. We therefore conclude that the relief sought by Tkach-Pelgrim is not available by way of mandamus. 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