

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-1248**

---

CYNTHIA HARMON; FRAZIER SHACK; YVETTA HORSFORD SMITH;  
SHONDALE ALFORD; MELVIN RILEY,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

DYNCORP INTERNATIONAL, INC., a/k/a DynCorp International  
LLC, d/b/a DynCorp International FZ-LLC,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema,  
District Judge. (1:13-cv-01597-LMB-TRJ)

---

Submitted: October 30, 2015                      Decided: December 14, 2015

---

Before WYNN, FLOYD, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Scott J. Bloch, John Carl Francesco Vinci, LAW OFFICES OF SCOTT  
J. BLOCH, PA, Washington, D.C., for Appellants. Jason  
Branciforte, LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C., Washington, D.C., for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Plaintiffs Cynthia Harmon, Frazier Shack, Yvetta Horsford Smith, Shondale Alford, and Melvin Riley appeal the district court's order denying relief on their breach-of-contract, discrimination, and related claims against DynCorp International, Inc. Plaintiffs also appeal a separate order dismissing without prejudice their qui tam claim under the False Claims Act. Finding no error, we affirm.

The district court correctly held that Plaintiffs' complaint failed to allege sufficient facts to support an alter ego theory of liability against DynCorp. Plaintiffs alleged various acts of misconduct by two businesses that formerly employed them, but the complaint offered only vague and conclusory allegations imputing these acts to DynCorp. Accordingly, Plaintiffs failed to state a claim of alter ego liability against DynCorp. See Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009). Moreover, because DynCorp was the sole party Defendant, the district court did not err in dismissing the complaint in its entirety.

We further conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing Plaintiffs' False Claims Act claim or denying leave to file a fifth complaint after the first four proved unsuccessful. We therefore affirm the district court's judgment. 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