

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 25-14516
Non-Argument Calendar

CHRIS,

Individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

NATHAN,

Individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

JOHN DOE,

Individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

CHRIS DOE,

Petitioner,

versus

MCKESSON CORPORATION,

DAVID CIFU,

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Georgia
D.C. Docket No. 4:19-cv-00189-RSB-CLR

Before ROSENBAUM, GRANT, and BRASHER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Plaintiffs Chris, Nathan, and John Doe appeal the denial of their petitions for a writ of mandamus compelling the clerk of the district court to unseal their original complaint. The district court denied the petitions because the plaintiffs failed to provide grounds to justify unsealing the documents. After careful review, we affirm the district court.

I.

The plaintiffs filed their original complaint in 2019. At the plaintiffs' request, the district court allowed the complaint and its several hundred pages of exhibits to be provisionally sealed. In 2021, the plaintiffs filed an amended complaint, unsealed, alleging that defendants, McKesson Corporation and Dr. David Cifu, conspired to prevent injured veterans from accessing hyperbaric oxygen treatment. On August 2, 2023, the district court entered final judgment against the plaintiffs. We dismissed the plaintiffs' subsequent appeal for failure to prosecute.

In 2025, the plaintiffs filed post-judgment petitions for writs of mandamus, asking the district court to direct the clerk of the court to enter all documents onto the public docket, including

25-14516

Opinion of the Court

3

those which had been sealed. The district court denied the mandamus petitions on December 16, 2025.

On December 29, 2025, the district court entered an order making our mandate from the earlier appeal the district court court's judgment. On the same day, plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal from the December 2025 orders and, again, from the August 2, 2023 final judgment. The defendants moved to dismiss the appeal. We granted the motion to dismiss as to the August 2, 2023 final judgment and December 29, 2025 order. We now address the plaintiffs' appeal from the December 16, 2025 order denying mandamus.

II.

The plaintiffs argue that leaving the original complaint sealed impeded the prosecution of the case and adversely affected the flow of information about the defendants' alleged misconduct. The defendants argue the plaintiffs failed to establish their right to obtain mandamus relief. We agree with the defendants.

Mandamus is available only in drastic situations, when no other adequate means are available to remedy a clear usurpation of power or abuse of discretion. *United States v. Shalhoub*, 855 F.3d 1255, 1259 (11th Cir. 2017); *Jackson v. Motel 6 Multipurpose, Inc.*, 130 F.3d 999, 1004 (11th Cir. 1997). The petitioner must demonstrate that his right to relief is clear and indisputable and that he has no other avenue of relief. *Mallard v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 490 U.S. 296, 309 (1989).

The plaintiffs have not met their burden to establish that they are entitled to mandamus relief. Although they allege the sealed complaint adversely affected the flow of information about the defendants' alleged misconduct, the plaintiffs offer no legal authority to indicate they have a right to have their original complaint unsealed. And the plaintiffs cite no authority to suggest that a court clerk has a duty to place documents sealed at the direction of the district court on the public docket. Nor do the plaintiffs attempt to establish that mandamus is the only relief available to them. In fact, the plaintiffs, who themselves initially requested that the complaint be sealed, could have filed a motion to unseal the complaint anytime between filing it in 2019 and the district court's August 2023 final judgment. The plaintiffs had the adequate alternative remedy of requesting relief directly from the district court, rather than attempting to compel an action of the court clerk by a post-judgment writ of mandamus. Because the plaintiffs did not supply facts or legal authority to establish the required elements, they are not entitled to mandamus relief.

III.

Accordingly, the district court's denial of the plaintiffs' petitions for a writ of mandamus is **AFFIRMED**.