

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

**No. 15-2039**

JERMAINE CAPEL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES  
DIVISION OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT; NORFOLK JUVENILE AND  
DOMESTIC RELATIONS DISTRICT COURT; CHESAPEAKE JUVENILE AND  
DOMESTIC RELATIONS DISTRICT COURT,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Arenda L. Wright Allen,  
District Judge. (2:15-cv-00227-AWA-LRL)

Submitted: February 23, 2016

Decided: April 4, 2016

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jermaine Capel, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jermaine Capel appeals the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his civil complaint challenging the calculation of his child support payments. For the reasons set forth below, we affirm.

Although the district court dismissed the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) (2012) for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted after Capel failed to cure the identified deficiencies in his complaint, we find that no amendment to the complaint in this case would have cured the fact that the district court lacked subject matter jurisdiction. See Cantor v. Cohen, 442 F.3d 196, 202 (4th Cir. 2006) (noting "the long established precedent that federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction and generally abstain from hearing child custody matters").

Moreover, the record reveals that the Chesapeake Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court ordered Capel in December 2014 to pay \$4620.18 in arrears to support his son. Because Capel appears to be seeking review of this state court order in federal court, his action is barred under the Rooker-Feldman\* doctrine.

---

\* D.C. Ct. of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462 (1983); Rooker v. Fid. Tr. Co., 263 U.S. 413 (1923).

We therefore affirm the district court's order on the ground that the court lacked jurisdiction to consider Capel's claims. 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