

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-2045**

---

LEWANDA PARTHENIA EPES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

GREEN TREE FINANCIAL SERVICING CORPORATION;  
KIRK D. MCQUIDDY, Law Office; SPECIALIZED,  
INCORPORATED OF VIRGINIA; HAWTHORNE &  
HAWTHORNE, Attorneys,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

-----  
CINDY PEARSON,

Movant.

---

-----  
Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, District  
Judge. (3:04-cv-00455-REP)

---

-----  
Submitted: April 9, 2007

Decided: May 21, 2007

---

-----  
Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

-----  
Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

-----  
Lewanda Parthenia Epes, Appellant Pro Se. Brian R. M. Adams, Bryan  
G. Scott, SPOTTS FAIN, PC, Richmond, Virginia; Mark Charles  
Nanavati, SINNOTT, NUCKOLS & LOGAN, PC, Midlothian, Virginia;  
Lawrence Alexis Dunn, MORRIS & MORRIS, Richmond, Virginia; Raymond

Paul Childress, Jr., Michele Adams Mulligan, Kristie Gay Haynes,  
MCSWEENEY, CRUMP, CHILDRESS & GOULD, PC, Richmond, Virginia, for  
Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lewanda Parthenia Epes appeals the district court's order dismissing her civil action. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny Appellee Green Tree Financial Servicing Corporation's motion for sanctions and affirm substantially on the reasoning of the district court.\* See Epes v. Green Tree Fin. Servicing Corp., No. 3:04-cv-00455-REP (E.D. Va. Dec. 14, 2004; May 12, 2006; Aug. 24, 2006). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

---

\*Although the district court was not deprived of subject matter jurisdiction by the state court's entry of judgment in Epes's parallel state action, see Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp., 544 U.S. 280, 284, 292 (2005), the district court properly dismissed this action with prejudice because it was precluded by the doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel.