

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1484

LEANORA NELSON; SELENA NELSON CECCHINI, Natural Daughter
and Heir at Law of Rosalind Nelson deceased; JEAN NELSON
LUMSBY,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

LEVY CENTER LLC,

Defendant - Appellee,

v.

HORACE JONES; THE LAW OFFICES OF HORACE JONES; THE WILCY R.
NELSON FAMILY, LLC,

Third Party Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Beaufort. Sol Blatt, Jr., Senior District
Judge. (9:11-cv-01184-SB)

Submitted: October 31, 2016

Decided: December 7, 2016

Before SHEDD, KEENAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Leanora Nelson, Selena Nelson Cecchini, Jean Nelson Lumsby,
Appellants Pro Se. Demetri K. Koutrakos, Louis H. Lang,

CALLISON, TIGHE & ROBINSON, LLC, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Leanora Nelson, Selena Nelson Cecchini, and Jean Nelson Lumsby (collectively, "the Nelsons") appeal from the district court's order adopting the recommendations of the magistrate judge and granting summary judgment in their civil action to Defendant Levy Center LLC. The district court determined that dismissal of certain of the Nelsons' claims was warranted under the Rooker-Feldman¹ doctrine and that the entire action was barred under the applicable statute of limitations. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error in the district court's determination that the Nelsons' action was barred by the applicable statute of limitations. We therefore affirm the district court's judgment on this basis.² Nelson v. Levy Ctr. LLC, No. 9:11-cv-01184-SB (D.S.C. Mar. 30, 2016).

¹ D.C. Ct. App. v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462 (1983); Rooker v. Fid. Tr. Co., 263 U.S. 413 (1923).

² After the district court issued its judgment, this court issued an opinion clarifying the scope of the Rooker-Feldman doctrine. Thana v. Bd. of License Comm'rs for Charles Cty., Md., 827 F.3d 314 (4th Cir. 2016). Because we affirm here on an alternate basis, we find it unnecessary to consider whether the district court's Rooker-Feldman analysis comports with Thana. We also reject as without merit the Nelsons' appellate arguments suggestive of potential bias by the district court and suggesting that the court erred by considering matters not cited by Levy Center LLC in its summary judgment motion.

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.

AFFIRMED