UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-1532

In Re: GARY B. WILLIAMS,

Petitioner.

No. 13-1533

In Re: GARY B. WILLIAMS,

Petitioner.

No. 13-1534

In Re: GARY B. WILLIAMS,

Petitioner.

No. 13-1535

In Re: GARY B. WILLIAMS,

Petitioner.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

On Petitions for Writs of Mandamus.
(3:12-cv-00055-HEH; 3:11-cv-00709-HEH;
3:11-cv-00125-HEH; 3:11-cv-00311-HEH)

Submitted: June 13, 2013 Decided: June 17, 2013

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Petitions denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Gary B. Williams, Petitioner Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gary Buterra Williams petitions for writs of mandamus seeking orders in four separate actions in the district court compelling the district court to grant his motions to vacate state court orders in criminal prosecutions; ordering the district court to grant him leave to proceed in forma pauperis, allow him to amend his complaint, and recuse the district court judge in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) action; and directing the Respondent to file a responsive pleading to his habeas petition. We conclude that Williams is not entitled to mandamus relief.

Mandamus relief is a drastic remedy and should be used only in extraordinary circumstances. Kerr v. United States Dist. Court, 426 U.S. 394, 402 (1976); United States v. Moussaoui, 333 F.3d 509, 516-17 (4th Cir. 2003). Further, mandamus relief is available only when the petitioner has a clear right to the relief sought. In re First Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n, 860 F.2d 135, 138 (4th Cir. 1988). 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 Williams is not available by way of mandamus. Accordingly, we deny the petitions for writs of mandamus. With respect to Williams' request for a writ of mandamus ordering the Respondent to file a responsive pleading, as the Respondent has answered Williams' petition and the

district court has since dismissed the action, we deny Williams' petition as moot. We also grant Williams' motion to supplement his petition for a writ of mandamus and deny Williams' motion to stay the district court proceedings.

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.

PETITIONS DENIED