

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-1650**

---

BISMARCK KWAKU TORKORNOO,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

NINA HELWIG, Esq.; JOHN MONAHAN, Esq.; MARY TORKORNOO;  
JACQUELINE NGOLE, Esq.,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Theodore D. Chuang, District Judge.  
(8:15-cv-02652-TDC)

---

Submitted: October 31, 2016

Decided: December 8, 2016

---

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

---

Vacated and remanded by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Bismark Kwaku Torkornoo, Appellant Pro Se. Nina Helwig, John  
Monahan, Jacqueline Ngole, Appellees Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Bismark Kwaku Torkornoo appeals the district court's order dismissing his civil action on the basis of the Rooker-Feldman\* doctrine after finding that Torkornoo's claims arose out of or were inextricably intertwined with prior state court proceedings. Subsequent to the district court's order, we clarified the narrow scope of the Rooker-Feldman doctrine in Thana v. Bd. Of License Commissioners for Charles City, 827 F.3d 314 (4th Cir. 2016), explaining that the doctrine does not apply "if a plaintiff in federal court does not seek review of the state court judgment itself but instead presents an independent claim" that is related to a matter decided by a state court. Id. at 320 (internal quotation marks and emphasis omitted). Instead, "any tensions between the two proceedings should be managed through the doctrines of preclusion, comity, and abstention." Id.

Because the district court's Rooker-Feldman analysis may be inconsistent with our recent clarification, we vacate its order and remand for reconsideration in light of Thana. We deny as moot Appellee Monahan's motion to dismiss. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately

---

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

presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

VACATED AND REMANDED