

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-2083

HEKYONG PAK,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DELORES RIDGELL, Assistant Bar Counsel for Attorney
Grievance Commission of Maryland; ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE
COMMISSION OF MARYLAND,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. Richard D. Bennett, District Judge.
(1:10-cv-01421-RDB)

Submitted: April 23, 2012

Decided: June 12, 2012

Before DUNCAN and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Robert S. Catz, Washington, D.C., for Appellant. Douglas F.
Gansler, Attorney General of Maryland, Steven M. Sullivan, H.
Scott Curtis, Assistant Attorneys General, Baltimore, Maryland,
for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Hekyong Pak appeals the district court's orders dismissing her action against the Defendants and denying her motion to reconsider the dismissal of her civil action. Pak sought to overturn her state disbarment and alleged improprieties regarding that proceeding. On appeal, Pak raises two issues: (1) whether the district court erred in finding that part of her suit was barred by the Rooker-Feldman doctrine;* and (2) whether State Bar Counsel Delores Ridgell was protected by immunity. For the reasons that follow, we affirm.

First, we find no error in the district court's application of the Rooker-Feldman doctrine in declining to reconsider Pak's disbarment. Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp., 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005); Davani v. Va. Dep't of Transp., 434 F.3d 712, 715-16 (4th Cir. 2006). Second, we find that the district court properly found Ridgell to be immune from suit for her participation in Pak's disciplinary proceedings. Gill v. Ripley, 724 A.2d 88, 96 (Md. 1999). Finally, to the extent Pak challenges the denial of her motion to reconsider, we find no abuse of discretion by the district court. Robinson v.

* See D.C. Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462, 486 (1983); Rooker v. Fid. Trust Co., 263 U.S. 413, 415-16 (1923).

Wix Filtration Corp., 599 F.3d 403, 407 (4th Cir. 2010)
(providing review standard).

Accordingly, we affirm both orders for the reasons stated by the district court. Pak v. Ridgell, No. 1:10-cv-01421-RDB (D. Md. Aug. 1, 2011 & Sept. 12, 2011). We deny Pak's motion to vacate the Clerk's order denying her motion for leave to file an addendum to her reply brief. 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